DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 379 201 SO 024 736

AUTHOR Scott, David Laurel
TITLE Cross-Cultural Value Orientations: Clinical Implications from an Analysis of the Theory and Research.
PUB DATE Aug 94
NOTE 74p.; Doctoral Dissertation, Biola University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Clinical Psychology; Cultural Background; Cultural Context; *Culture; *Psychology; Social Science Research; *Values

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to consider what relevant clinical applications can be generated from a thorough review and critique of the theoretical and empirical literature pertaining to cross-cultural value orientations. The Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) theory of value orientations and their Value Schedule was presented. The 3 elements of value orientations are the cognitive, the affective, and the directive. Meanwhile, the study also criticized research presented by those people who, claimed that value orientations strongly influence both social and personality systems, followed Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's theory and provided remarkably similar and clearly elucidated summaries of that theory. The critique of those studies indicated numerous methodological and some statistical weaknesses that undermine the reliability, validity, and in some cases the generalizability of the results and conclusions obtained. Until the reliability and validity of value orientations and instruments can be firmly established, the potential benefits, for example cross-cultural values data increases the general social science knowledge base, can offer our society, the science of psychology, and the professions of clinical and counseling psychology a great deal. (Author/ML)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SO

ED 379 201

CROSS-CULTURAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS: CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS FROM AN ANALYSIS OF THE THEORY AND RESEARCH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Doctoral Research Paper

Presented to

the Faculty of the Rosemead School of Psychology

Biola University

In Partial Fufillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Psychology

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DAVID L. SCOTT
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

by

David Laurel Scott

August, 1994

SO 024 736

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CROSS-CULTURAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS:

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS FROM AN

ANALYSIS OF THE THEORY

AND RESEARCH

by

David Laurel Scott

APPROVED:

Dolores Jenerson-Madden Date 8/30/94
First Reader

Date 8/30/94
Second Reader

APPROVED:

Dean

8/30/94
Date

Copyright © 1994 by David Laurel Scott

ABSTRACT

CROSS-CULTURAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS:
CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS FROM
ANALYSIS OF THE THEORY
AND RESEARCH

by

David Laurel Scott

A review and critique of value orientations theory and research is presented. The seminal study by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck introduces the theory and the first instrument purported to measure value orientations, entitled the Value Schedule. Other researchers used the Value Schedule or developed new instruments designed to measure value orientations. A critique of the literature uncovered numerous reliability, validity, and generalizability weaknesses resulting from poor methodological rigor. As a consequence, the results of these studies are considered suspect. Due to the weakness of the research, conclusions and applications are offered with extreme caution. Goals for future research are presented.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

DOCTORAL RESEARCH PAPER

Introduction....1

A Historical Review....3

Summary of the Historical Review....11

A Critique and Analysis of Value Orientation Instruments and Studies...12

Theoretical and Methodological Strengths....13

Theoretical, Methodological and Statistical Weaknesses....15

Results and Conclusions....34

Applying the Research....49

Recommendations for Future Research....58

REFERENCES....61

CROSS-CULTURAL VALUE ORIENTATIONS: CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS FROM AN ANALYSIS OF THE THEORY AND RESEARCH

Introduction

The United States is a multi-racial, multi-ethnic, and multi-cultural nation which continues to grow in its diversity each and every year. The 1990 U.S. Census estimated the U.S. population to be 250,122,000 on January 1, 1990 (Hollmann, 1990). As of 1989, there were approximately 209,326,000 Whites (accounting for 84.1% of the U.S. population), 30,788,000 Blacks (accounting for 12.4 % of the U.S. population), 6,881,000 Asian and Pacific Islanders (accounting for 2.8% of the U.S. population) and 1,737,000 American Indian,Eskimo and Aleut (accounting for 0. 7% of the U.S. population). Each of these racial groups are composed of a variety of ethnic and cultural groups. For example, according to the July, 1989 estimates (Hollmann,1990), there were approximately 20,528,000 people of Hispanic origin (accounting for 8.3% of the U.S. population). Hispanics are not considered a separate racial group because they are represented across and among racial groups already identified.

The pressing and changing needs of the culturally diverse American population have become the concern of clinical and counseling psychologists (Carter, 1991; Ibrahim, 1991; Sue & Zane, 1987) as they attempt to improve the quality of their service to all clients regardless of race or culture. This study seeks to contribute to that cause in its exploration of cross-cultural values.

Approximately 2% of the U.S. population, or about 4-5 million people, suffer from a "Serious Mental Illness"(SMI) (Barker et al., 1992) according to the 1992 U.S. Mental Health Report made by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the National Institute of Mental Health. According to 1989 figures used in that report, Whites account for

86.1% of the adults with SMI while Blacks account for 12.0% and other races account for 1.8%. Of those who sought help from a mental health professional, 86.36% were White, 11.81% were Black, and 1.87% were of another race. Inpatient care, according to 1986 figures, was made up of 71.82% Whites and 28.18% other races. Whites accounted for 84.6% of all outpatient care received while other races accounted for the other 15.4% of services offered. Outpatient admissions were 85.04% White and 14.98% other races. Although the majority of problems experienced and services received are by the White majority population, an important share of the total problems experienced and services received are by the nonwhite population. The complexity of the situation greatly increases when considering the variety of unique differences, especially value differences, represented among the numerous ethnic and cultural groups which compose the various races.

Summary indicators of the population distribution (Hollmann, 1990) reveal noteworthy changes in U.S. population characteristics with reference to race. From 1980-1989 the White population has decreased by 1.8%, the Black population has increased by 0.6% and other races have increased by 1.2%. Population projections from the middle estimate series (Day, 1992), based on the 1990 census, estimates that the U.S. population will grow from 252 million in 1991 to 383 million in 2050. Further projections reveal that only 52.7% of these 383 million people will be non-Hispanic Whites, while 21.1% will be of Hispanic origin, 15% will be Black, 10.1% will be Asian and Pacific Islanders and 1.1% will be American Indian, Eskimo and Aleut.

Immigration is suggested to have a significant role in the growth of some races and ethnicities in the United States. "In fact, the number of Asian immigrants is projected to exceed the number of Asian births for the next thirty years"(Day, 1992, p. xix). Although this study states that the Hispanic population may be more influenced by natural increase than immigration, it leaves open the possibility that immigration could be the major reason for Hispanic growth in the United States.

Every individual belongs to at least one cultural group with its particular values, norms, and patterns. Some of these groups possess more contrasting parameters. Even White, middle-class Americans are a part of a culture group (Stewart, 1991). SMI and other mental health

problems impact individuals across racial, ethnic and cultural groups.

The projected changes in the characteristics of the U.S. population with regards to growth in number and racial make-up could impact the future state of clinical and counseling psychology and involve greater cultural diversity among those individuals in need of mental health assistance. Not only could patient cultural diversity increase, but cultural diversity among mental health professionals will, hopefully, increase, too. With all these changes in the offing, the potential for an extensive increase in the number of cross-cultural psychotherapeutic relationships is greatly heightened.

Unaddressed cross-cultural psychotherapeutic relationships have often been the source of ineffective or damaging mental health treatment (Carter, 1991; Ibrahim, 1991; Sue & Zane, 1987). The better part of clinical wisdom exhorts each mental health practitioner to acquire as much cross-cultural training as possible to avoid the therapeutic pitfalls of cultural misunderstanding and miscommunication. Value orientations theory (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) is an integral component of the cultural difference issue. It is the purpose of this paper to consider what relevant clinical applications can be generated from a thorough review and critique of the theoretical and empirical literature pertaining to cross-cultural value orientations.

A Historical Review

Value orientations appeared in the social science literature as early as the 1950's when Florence Kluckhohn used them in phrases like cultural value orientations (Kluckhohn, 1951) and cultural orientations (Kluckhohn, 1950). These phrases were theoretical forerunners to the value orientations concept (Kluckhohn, 1953). The phrase value orientations as a separate concept was not officially documented in the psychological literature until its use in an article by Williamson (1958). The term was used in a nonspecific sense referring to values held by individuals. The following year, Lowe (1959) began to specify and structure the concept value orientations by dividing it into four orientations which could impact the therapeutic and ethical practice of a psychologist. Attempts to collate the value orientations concept between the research worlds of sociology, psychology, and anthropology did not occur until years later

(Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Definitional and conceptual conflicts continue to occur when using the phrase value orientations and the term culture.

In their groundbreaking study, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) were attempting to go beyond the typically oversimplified, static and dominant conceptualization of values which are portrayed as variant masters of human behavior. They stated, "Our most basic assumption is that there is a systematic variation in the realm of cultural phenomena which is both as definite and as essential as the demonstrated systematic variation in physical and biological phenomena" (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 3). Value orientations were defined as:

> ...complex but definitely patterned (rank-ordered) principles, resulting from the transactional interplay of three analytically distinguishable elements of the evaluative process--the cognitive, the affective, and the directive elements--which give order and direction to the ever-flowing stream of human acts and thoughts as these relate to the solution of "common human" problems. (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 4).

These authors assume that there are a limited set of value problems which are basic and universal to all cultures at all times and the solutions to these problems are not existentially infinite or random but variable within the limitations of a few potential choices. Further, they theorize that not only are specific solutions chosen to answer these value problems but the alternate solutions are ranked according to cultural preference. The variation of these value-orientations is not only due to different cultural rank-patternings but also from the degree of implicit or explicit awareness of those value orientations and patternings which influence behavior.

Five problems with their corresponding substantive questions are tentatively identified. The authors suggest these are common and crucial problems in need of definitive solutions within any particular culture. These problems with their alternate solutions are listed as follows: (a) Human Nature orientation or What is the character of innate human nature? (Solutions = Good, Evil, or a Mixture of Good/Evil), (b) Man-Nature orientation or What is the relation of man to nature and supernature? (Solutions = Subjugation-to-Nature, Harmony-with-Nature, or Mastery-over-Nature), (c) Time orientation or What is the temporal focus of

human life? (Solutions = Past, Present, or Future), (d) Activity orientation or What is the modality of human activity? (Solutions = Being, Being-in-Becoming, or Doing), (e) Relational orientation or What is the modality of man's relationship to other men? (Solutions = Lineal, Collateral or Individualistic).

A total of 106 subjects from five communities in the southwestern United States were chosen as a part of this study. The culture groups represented were Navaho Indian, Pueblo Indian, Spanish-American, Mormon, and Texan/Oklahoman homesteaders. Previous studies and anthropological observations were used to offer predictions about value orientations to be derived from the Value Schedule, an interview instrument developed by the authors to determine value orientation variations for each particular culture. The Value Schedule consisted of 22 items presented in an interview format. The Value Schedule questions were represented as inquiries about hypothetical, general-life situations or ways of living and the respondent was to choose a resolution for that particular situation. Statistical procedures were performed to determine within-culture regularities and between-culture differences.

Approximately 10-12 years after the Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961) study, Mezei (1974) published a factorial validity study of the Value Schedule. Both varimax and quartimax rotations were performed on the factor solutions resulting in two main bipolar factors emerging from the quartimax rotation and seven main factors emerging from the varimax rotation.

The Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) was used in a study of Japanese value orientations (Caudill & Scarr, 1962). The authors' purpose in conducting this study was threefold: (a) to gain a cultural reference point from which to assess psychiatric patients and to make appropriate interventions, (b) to gather information on the direction of value orientations and culture change in Japan, and (c) to build upon the work of Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) by adding another measurement of variations in value orientations for a culture who had not yet been assessed.

The procedure involved having 619 high school seniors, from a small, medium, and large Japanese city, and their same-sexed parent fill out the Value Schedule and a demographics questionnaire. Changes were made to the Value Schedule by Caudill and Scarr (1962) which included: (a) an assessment on only three of the orientations--Relational, Time, and

Man-Nature--with a total of 23 items; (b) a more concrete operationalizing of terms used in the study; (c) a ruling that any response with a tie occuring between ranked orientations was unusable; (d) substituting some of the specific content in items with content which would be more realistic to the Japanese people; and (e) translating the measure into Japanese.

The concept of value orientations distance was an important addition to this study (Caudill and Scarr, 1962). It offered a conceptual schema of and measurement procedure for cultural transmission. The procedure to determine value orientation distance involves hierarchically positioning variant-value-orientation-alternative-patterns in order to determine specific value orientation differences between individuals such as differences between a parent and child. Value orientation position ranks were labeled as the dominant value or the major/first, second, or third-ordered variant based upon the percentage of respondents who held that value orientation. Greatest success for transmission of values was labeled as zero-distance or, in other words, when both child and parent share identical values.

Papajohn and Spiegel (1971) used the Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961) Value Schedule in their study of the relationship between culture change and psychological stress. The authors reported that previous research had consistently demonstrated a positive correlation between degree of acculturation and degree of personality disturbance evidenced on the Rorschach test. The Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) and the Rorschach test (Worcester Scoring System) were administered to 97 subjects individually by social workers and clinical psychologists respectively. The subjects consisted of 34 Greek families with second-generation, American-born children. Half of the sample had a second-generation family member who was hospitalized with a psychosis. It is important to note that, in this study, the Kluckhohn andStrodtbeck (1961) Value Schedule was being used to determine within-culture differences rather than between-culture differences, which is how it was initially used.

The Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) was also used to assess three Papau New Guinea groups (Harrison, 1974), specifically the Kewa, the Ukarumpa, and Goroka High School students. It was translated into Pidgin and Kewa along with some minor changes to the contents of the hypothesized situations to make the interview scenarios more realistic and relevant to their particular culture. Fifty Kewa men, 100 Ukarumpa men, and 75 Goroka High

School students were assessed with the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Administrations between groups varied. The Kewa were presented with a tape recording of the directions and interview questions, in order to enhance overall reliability, while the Ukarumpa had a direct translation read to them by the interviewer. The Goroka students also had a direct translation read to them but they were also presented with a written copy of the interview questions and were allowed to respond by marking their answers on a form. It was noted that the rank-ordering procedure for value orientations was difficult for the Kewa but the other two groups, the Ukarumpa and Goroka students, had no particular difficulty with the assessment process. Several interviews were discarded when the interviewer surmised that the level of comprehension of the interviewee was poor enough to invalidate any results.

Bachtold & Eckvall (1978) sought to "...examine the current value orientations of the Hupa (a group of Athapaskan-speaking Indians), and to compare them with traditional Hupa values inferred from earlier descriptive reports of the culture" (p. 368). Twenty-one respondents were administered the Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961) Value Schedule to determine those value orientations.

In another study (Brink, 1984), the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) was used with the Afaha Obong clan. They are an Annang-speaking people of the Cross River State of Nigeria and are a polygamous subsistence farming culture whose living conditions are very basic. Twenty-eight people were interviewed with a version of the Values Schedule that was translated into their language.

DuBray (1985) employed the use of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) to measure cultural difference between 36 American Indian and 36 Anglo-American professional female social workers. The authors hypothesized culture value differences between the two groups for the four value orientations assessed.

Kohls in 1981 (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) developed a measure, entitled the Intercultural Values Inventory (ICV), which followed the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck theory but departed from their rank-order interview schedule. Carter and Helms (1990) report that, "...the ICV is composed of proverbial and value statements which reflect the three different alternative solutions for each of the five value-orientations" (p.7) as defined by Kluckhohn

and Strodtbeck (1961). The test is structured in a forced-choice format and uses an interval measurement scoring approach rather than the ordinal approach of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Ten statements are offered for each alternative and three alternatives comprise each of the five value-orientations for a total of 150 statements on the ICV.

An initial pilot study was conducted by Carter in1984 (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) to determine the reliability of Kohls' 1981 measure (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990). The ICV was administered to 347 undergraduate students. Cronbach Alpha computed reliabilities ranged from .37 to .73. An item-analysis of subscales was performed. The "...items with low item/total subscale correlations were rewritten to reflect more clearly the same or similar conceptual meaning as the remaining items of the respective scales with high corrected item/total correlations" (Carter & Helms, 1990, p. 9-10). Gender related terminology was replaced with generic equivalents. With these two revisions in place, the reliabilities for the ICV were reinvestigated. They had improved to a range of .50 to .79.

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) value orientations theory had been used, in the form of the Value Schedule, to assess several cultures, but it took Carter and Helms (1987) and the ICV to examine the Black American pattern of cultural values. Carter and Helms (1987) sought to determine which, if any, of the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) value orientations might characterize Black American respondents. Further, they wished to determine "...(a) whether racial identity attitudes could be used to predict Black respondents' value-orientations, and (b) if so, which value-orientations were predictable" (Carter & Helms, 1987, p.188). The Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RAIS), the ICV, and a personal data sheet were given to 174 college students.

In another study, Carter (1990) sought to explore racial differences in the value orientations of African-Americans. According to the author, the literature supports the assumption "...that African-American values and value systems are different from those of other races and cultures" (Carter, 1990, p.73). The ICV and a personal data sheet were administered to 799 college students consisting of 293 African -American and 506 White-American.

It was of interest to Carter and Parks (1992) to examine if it was "...possible to distinguish second or later-generation White ethnic groups on the basis of their cultural values" (p.499). They note literature which suggests that White-American ethnics can be identified by their distinct cultural values. Subjects consisted of 434 White college students throughout three regions of the U.S. The ICV and a personal data sheet were administered. Self-reported ethnicity and place of birth on a demographics questionnaire determined the individuals culture and generational status. If the student was born in the U.S. then he or she was considered at least a second-generation immigrant descendent. The authors were unable to determine third or higher generational status. These authors wished to explore whether or not a student's cultural values could identify his or her particular ethnicity and, if they could, which specific values could do so.

The Intercultural Values Inventory by Kohls, Carter and Helms in 1984 (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) has not been the only descendent of the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) Value Schedule. Szapocznik, Scopetta, Aranalde and Kurtines (1978) developed a Value Orientations Scale (VO) based on the work by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961). This scale consisted of 22 problem situations reflecting the nature of the five human problems defined by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961). A Spanish and English version were made because the study sought to explore the cultural value difference between adolescent Cuban immigrants and adolescent Anglo-Americans. The respondents were required to indicate the best and worst of the three available choices and each alternative was considered a separate variable and given a value accordingly.

"The VO scale was developed using Sample 1, and the hypotheses were tested using Sample 2" (Szapocznik et al., 1978, p. 967). Sample 1 had 276 respondents (76% Cubans and 24% Anglo Americans) while Sample 2 had 208 respondents (73% Anglo-Americans and 27% Cubans). Factor analyses, using an alpha solution and an oblique rotation, were conducted on data from Sample 1 resulting in four (4) identifiable factors. Chronbach Alpha coefficients for the four (4) factors were .89, .84, .76 and .72, respectively, and were deemed to be of acceptable consistency. "...Four orthogonal VO subscales with high internal consistencies...provided... high factorial validity" (Szapocznik et al., 1978, p.964). Sample 2 item responses were

identically scored as to the procedures for Sample 1. Sample 2 Chronbach Alpha coefficients for Factors 1, 2, 3 and 4 were .76, .58, .51 and .46 respectively.

A follow-up study (Szapocznik, Kurtines & Hanna, 1979) sought to replicate the previous study (Szapocznik et al., 1978) using a clinical adult population rather than the previous nonclinical adolescent population. Half of the 52 total subjects were Cuban and half were Anglo-American. The subjects were non-psychotic outpatient adults and were administered a demographics questionnaire and the Value Orientation Scale (Szapocznik et al., 1978). A comparison between the two groups for each of the four value orientations was made.

Keller and Bergstrom (1993) used another value orientations assessment tool, developed by Murdaugh (1982), and also entitled the Value Orientation Scale (VOS). Murdaugh (1982) first used this instrument as one of several personality measures to explore individual differences in preventive behaviors for heart disease. The VOS is a vignette-type of instrument, based upon the Value Schedule developed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), and used to assess the value orientations of Time, Activity, Relationships, and Human Nature (Murdaugh & Hinshaw, 1986). This instrument was used as an indicator of health value orientations which "are aspects of an individual's principles that commit them to personally prefer well-being as opposed to a situation in which they are able to make a choice"(Murdaugh & Hinshaw, 1986, p. 20). In the initial development of the VOS, a total of 76 subjects were asked to fill out a demograpics questionnaire and to complete the various scales. Test-retest coefficients for the VOS ranged from .32 to .68. Internal consistency theta coefficients ranged from .46 to .72 while Chronbach Alphas were much lower.

When Keller and Bergstrom (1993) used Murdaugh's (1982) VOS, they also administered an index of social status to explore the relationship between value orientations and demographic variables. The subject sample was composed of 80 inner-city, African-American women. A majority (55%) of these women were of low SES status while 24% were next-to-low SES status. Theta coefficients for the four value orientations ranged from .60 to .72.

Ibrahim in 1984 (cited in Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) developed the Scale to Assess World Views which was based upon and developed from the theories of C. Kluckhohn (1967) and F.R. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) and the Value Schedule. He extracted 24 statements,

reflecting the five Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) value orientations, from several measures of social psychological attitudes. Numerous researchers of cross-cultural psychology were mailed these statements and asked to categorize the statements under one of the five value orientations. Twenty of the judged responses were usable and any items which received 60% agreement among those 20 judges was included in the scale. This original scale was finally composed of ten items per each value orientation for a total of fifty items. It's developed on a Lickert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Not only was the author interested in the development of this instrument, but he wanted to use a statistical technique, known as multidimensional scaling procedures, that could examine intra- and intergroup response similarities and differences.

In the pilot study (Ibrahim & Kahn,1987), a principal components analysis with an oblique rotation was performed on 168 undergraduate and graduate student responses to the Scale to Assess World Views. "The empirical factor structure that emerged indicated a multidimensional system" (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987, p.166). The Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was .74. Based on the results of this pilot study, the scale was revised and reduced to 45 items. In this version, there are only three subscales with nine items in each category.

The official study (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) involved 501 undergraduate students who were predominantly suburban, white Catholics. After all the scales were completed and collected, a multidimensional scaling procedure (MDSCAL) was applied to the results. Based on Lijphart agreement scores, the Chronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was .98, while split-half reliability was .95 and .96, and odd-even reliability alpha was .95 and .96.

Green and Haymes (1973) developed the Value Orientation Questionnaire (VOQ) which is based on and developed from the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) Value Schedule. The authors were exploring variations in marijuana use, possible associations to psychosocial characteristics, and how such variations could be explained. The VOQ "...is an operationalization of reported desirable solutions (i.e., what *S* feels he 'ought' to feel or think) to five such common areas of human choice" (Green & Haymes, 1973, p.215). These five common areas of human choice are the five cultural problems presented by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961). There are 46 questions instead of 45 questions because the authors added one

question on a sixth dimension of human nature mutability which is an issue addressed in the value orientations theory but not assessed by the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). The VOQ is structured to a Lickert scale with response levels from complete disagreement (0) to complete agreement (5). The subjects were white, undergraduate psychology students and 475 of the 501 records received were useable. In addition to being administered the VOQ, the subjects were given the California Psychological Inventory (CPI) and a biographical demographics questionnaire which included a question assessing marijuana use. The authors report establishing validity by choosing two subsamples (N=142 and N=359), testing 6 months apart, and making predictions from the smaller sample to the larger sample.

Summary of the Historical Review

In summation, the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) theory of value orientations and their Value Schedule, the assessment tool used to detect and measure those value orientations, was presented. The original study using the Value Schedule assessed five southwestern U.S. communities of varying cultures. Years later, Mezei (1974) accorded construct validity to the Man-Nature, Activity, and Relational problem areas of the Value Schedule using a factor analysis. Caudill and Scarr (1962) explored Japanese value orientations with the Value Schedule and applied a culture transmission concept and procedure. The Value Schedule was also used as a measure of Greek within-culture change and acculturation as it related to personality disturbance as measured by the Rorschach (Papajohn & Spiegel,1971). The Hupa (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978) and the Afaha Obong clan (Brink, 1983) were both assessed with the Value Schedule as were American Indian and Anglo-American social workers (DuBray, 1985).

Variations on the Value Schedule have also been introduced and implemented. One such measure is the Intercultural Values Inventory (ICV) initially developed by Kohls (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) and revised by Carter in 1984 (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) and Carter and Helms (1990). This instrument was used to explore the relationship between values and racial identity attitudes (Carter & Helms, 1987), differentiate values between White Americans and Black Americans (Carter, 1990), and identify ethnic value differences among

Whites (Carter & Parks, 1992).

Another descendent of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1991) is the Value Orientation Scale (VO) (Szapocznik et al., 1978) which was used to identify cultural value differences between adolescent Cuban immigrants and adolescent Anglo-Americans. A follow-up replication study (Szapocznik et al., 1979) used the VO with a clinical adult population.

Value Orientation Scale (VOS) (Murdaugh, 1982) was the name given to another measure derived from the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck Value Schedule (1961). This instrument was used by Keller and Bergstrom (1993) to explore the relationship between value orientations and demograpic variables of African-American women.

The Scale to Assess World Views (cited in Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) was reported to be another descendent of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). A multidimensional scaling procedure revealed a five dimension solution tapping into intragroup variation.

Finally, the Value Orientation Questionnaire (VOQ) (Green & Haymes, 1973) was presented as the fifth measure based on and developed from the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). The VOQ was used to consider any association between marijuana use and what the authors termed psychosocial characteristics.

A Critique and Analysis of Value Orientation Theory and Studies

After consideration of the information presented, it appears that a viable working theory on value orientations has been developed, structured, tested and studied under a variety of conditions. Variations of test development, diverse roles played by the assessment tools, and theoretical and empirical additions made to the measures seem to highlight the flexibility of the theory. Some of these measures have assessed between-culture value orientation, others have assessed within-culture value orientation, while still others have attempted to assess both factors. Some studies have attempted to use the theory and corresponding test as a measure of acculturation or psychosocial characteristics. Regardless of the diverse uses, a substantial body of data exists in the name of value orientations, particularly when in reference to cross-cultural assessment. Having acquired a global value-orientations

perspective from a review of the literature, one is now prepared for a more detailed critique and analysis of that literature which highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the research.

Theoretical and Methodological Strengths

One of the overall strengths offered by the theory of cross-cultural value orientations, particularly as presented in detail by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), is the concept of an existential and organizational dynamism which is foundational to the cognitive, affective, and behavioral life of the individual as well as the structure and functioning of cultures and society at large. Structural and philosophical divisions between the social sciences may foster attempts to refute such a theory or deny its substantive goals and claims. Psychology has traditionally limited its conceptualizations of human nature to the individual as the base unit of evaluation. Only recently have authorities in the psychological sciences been open to acknowledging the influence and assessing the impact of the closely associated family system and peer group.

Embracing a theory which looks to culture as the foundation of social and psychological functioning may present an insurmountable struggle for many in the rank and file of the science and profession of psychology. Regardless of the difficulty involved, this theory deserves consideration if only because of the magnitude of existential depth implied by the assumptions and formulations which comprise this theory. The development of the Value Schedule was an honest attempt to create an instrument which could viably tap into the orientations of dominant and variant values espoused by the theory.

Those who continued the research begun by Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961) typically held to the value orientations theory even when they modified the Value Schedule, created a new but comparable measure, and/or used different terminology. This consistency lent credibility to the value orientation theory and, possibly, to the Value Schedule. Many of the studies (Brink, 1984; Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992; DuBray, 1985; Green & Haymes, 1973; Harrison, 1974; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971; Szapocznik et al., 1978) using the Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961) theory presented remarkably similar and clearly presented summaries of that theory. Kluckhohn and

Strodtbeck (1961) emphasized that it was beyond the scope of their study to assess intracultural variation of value orientations. Caudill and Scarr (1962) built upon and expanded their work by making intracultural value orientations the focus of their study. This not only lent affirmation to the theory itself, but demonstrated its flexability and potential.

Undoubtedly, the greatest reason this theory and the corresponding measures have accrued respectability and strength is because of their capability of meeting the challenge for which they were developed. Each study to be reviewed involves, in part, the assessment of a racial, intercultural, or intracultural group in the United States or abroad. Each study yields an unique profile of value orientation variations for each group. Only one study (Keller & Bergstrom, 1993) yielded results of no clearly defined value orientations because the instrument administered was assumed to be too difficult for the examinees to complete. In all other studies, clear and definite value orientation patterns emerged.

Another strength of this body of literature is the moderate to large sample sizes used in most of the studies. The two studies (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978; Brink, 1984) which had small sample sizes ($\underline{N}$=21 and $\underline{N}$=28, respectively) were attempting to assess limited and/or isolated cultural groups whose membership was not readily available. Otherwise, all other studies had samples of 52 up to 799 subjects with most of them having at least over one hundred participants.

In some studies it was necessary to translate the Value Schedule or one of the comparable measures into the language of the subjects (Brink, 1984; Caudill & Scarr, 1962; Harrison, 1974; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Szapocznik et al., 1978). In most cases, a back translation procedure process was instituted to insure accuracy and reliability of the translation. Back translation is a procedure whereby the text of the measure is translated from English into the other language. A separate individual, usually unconnected with the study, yet fluent in that other-than-English language, translates the text back into English. The original English version and the newly-translated-into-English version are then compared for accuracy. This thorough effort granted further credibility to these measures.

Additional methodological practices instituted across the value orientation literature has bolstered its veracity. For example, several studies (Brink, 1984; Caudill & Scarr, 1962; Green

& Haymes, 1973; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971; Szapocznik et al., 1979) attempted to balance gender representation amongst the respondents. Two other studies (DuBray, 1985; Keller & Bergstrom, 1993) controlled for gender effects by limiting the subjects to the same sex. Social desirability, acquiescence bias and/or Hawthorne effects were controlled for in three separate studies (Green & Haymes, 1973; Harrison, 1974; Murdaugh, 1982). Carter and Helms (1987) counterbalanced the administration of two measures being used in the study to control for potential test item effects.

This research also offers strong socio-political advantages. The value orientations theory (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) clearly organizes major differences between various cultures and presents those differences in a meaningful way to the researcher, practitioner and laity. Lingenfelter and Mayers (1986) insightfully suggest that "Conflict arises not only from personal and cultural differences, but also from the fact that people often attribute moral force to their priorities for personal behavior and judge those who differ from them as flawed, rebellious, or immoral" (p. 14). When considering other cultures in light of the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) theory and the generated data, variations in values, thoughts and behavior can be viewed as differences and not judged on a morality scale.

The theory (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) also allows for some level of behavior prediction to occur by those of another culture, lessening the lack of relational control frequently experienced in cross-cultural situations. Further, it expands one's understanding and appreciation of personality development and how culture shapes the personality at a very basic level. The value orientation theory enhances appreciation for personality expression. It reveals that personality functioning is dependent upon behavior spheres (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) and the degree of internalization of those value orientations (Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971).

Theoretical, Methodological and Statistical Weaknesses

A continuing and more probing critique and analysis, however, reveals a variety of problems, concerns, and questions with the value orientations theory and the empirical literature presented to support it. It is important to note throughout this review of methodology and statistical procedures that all probability (p) values were within an

acceptable range ($p<.05$ or lower) unless otherwise specified.

A fundamental weakness occured throughout this literature in the use of unwarranted assumptions and repetitive term and definition changes. The original study (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) developed an expansive theory full of assumptions which referenced little theoretical or empirical support from external sources. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) present a comprehensive and basic explanation of variations between cultural functioning which is built upon a number of assumptions, any one of which could be in error. The authors offer little other-generated theoretical or empirical support to bolster their own theory. If this theory and subsequent empirical studies are to be taken seriously, then these assumptions should be considered and possibly challenged theoretically and empirically so as to insure their validity.

Some of the assumptions upon which this study (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) is based should be considered, reviewed, and challenged. These assumptions are as follows: (a) a limited number of human problems exist, (b) these problems are faced by all peoples, (c) these problems are faced at all times, (d) solutions must be found, (e) there is a limited, nonrandom range of solutions to the problems, (f) all alternatives of all solutions are present in all societies at all times but differentially preferred, (g) only three rank-order choices exist, (h) the three rank-ordered choices given are the solutions that truly exist, (i) only five value orientation dimensions exist, (j) the five problems given are the ones that truly exist, (k) variations in value orientations are an interlocking network of dominant or most preferred value orientations and variant or other preferred value orientations, (l) value orientation differences between and within cultures are not absolutes but rather just variations in rank-orderings of the same value-orientation components common to all cultures at all times, and (m) there are two major types of societal differentiation common to all societies with the first being <u>subgroup differentiation</u> and the second being <u>behavior sphere differentiation</u>.

Numerous conjectures about the supposed functioning and significance of value orientations and value orientations theory were purported by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961). Some noteworthy quotes of such conjectures include "The concrete behavior of individuals in complex situations and the moral codes governing that behavior usually reflect all the orientations

simultaneously" (p. 16) and "The rate and degree of assimilation of any ethnic group to dominant American culture will depend in large part upon the degree of goodness of fit of the group's own rank-ordering of value orientations with that of the dominant culture" (p. 26). When considering the significant role this construct plays in culture and society, Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) state:

> ...little or no attention has been paid to variation in basic value orientations. The view advanced here is that variation in value orientations is the most important type of cultural variation and is, therefore, the central feature of the structure of culture. This is to say that the "systems of meanings" of a society...is more realistically and adequately derived from an analysis of the dynamic interrelationships of the variations in its value orientations than it is from a study of only the dominant values. (p. 28)

The relationship between value orientations and personality and the interactive role of the contextual environment are considered by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) when they state:

> No individual, any more than any society, can live wholly or always in accord with the patterns which express a single profile of value orientations. Each one has within himself, as a part of his personality, a rank-order of value orientations which is usually made apparent by a variable allocation of time and interest in the activities of the several behavior spheres and by variable behavior in the different spheres. (p. 31)

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) offer a more precise statement about the role of the contextual environment when they say "...basic change is usually, if not always, the result of the interplay of internal variations and external forces which are themselves variable" (p. 43).

Caudill and Scarr (1962) also used the Value Schedule and repeated the same assumption error committed by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961). In this study, the authors added the theoretical concept of cultural distance as a factor to be assessed and applied to the study of culture change and transmission. This idea was unchallenged and presented as assumed truth. The validity of these ideas may have been enhanced had these authors provided other-generated theoretical or empirical support so as to place the idea within the context of a

nomological net, but since they kept this idea isolated within the context of their own theory and study, limited credibility can be accorded to it.

The confusion created by unverified assumptions increased when terminology and definitions were changed and broadened. Two other studies (Carter & Parks, 1992; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) attempted to broaden the meaning of value orientations by associating it with the term world views, yet there was no rationale, theory or research presented for doing so. In fact, in the Ibrahim and Kahn (1987) article the phrase world views was defined differently from value orientations (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) even though the concept and the measure was based upon the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) theory of value orientations. Such instances of terminology obfuscation can hinder the clarity and validity of a study and the theory behind it.

All these prior weaknesses come to a head when considering the lack of definitional clarity found for the variable of culture. Discrepant assumptions and usages of that term pervade the literature. At times there are discrepancies within one study. In Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), the culture groups represented consisted of two different Indian tribes which were each considered a separate culture, a Spanish-American culture, a culture identified as Texans, and a Mormon group. The criteria used to define culture in this study does not appear to be qualitatively equal. The Indians and Spanish-Americans were being predominantly identified by race while another group was identified by their U.S. state locale and the last group was identified by their religion. This vascilation of culture criterion only confounds the theory and the meaning of any results obtained.

Other studies have assumed a particular race, locale or ethnicity constitute a culture (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992; Caudill & Scarr, 1962; DuBray, 1985; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Keller & Bergstrom, 1993; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971; Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979). Typically, these factors are a component of a culture but no single component should be the sole operational definition of culture in a scientific study. The development of an operational definition of culture is beyond the scope of this review; however, the need for such development is accentuated. Considerable investigation and effort into the development of operationalized definitions is paramount to

the validity of the theory and studies presented here.

Reliability problems were persistent throughout much of the literature. No formalized methods of establishing reliability were conducted (e.g., Chronbach Alphas, test-retest, split-half, mean-interitem analysis, etc.) for the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) Value Schedule. Reliability as consistency of response over time was not assessed. In fact, the authors themselves admitted that as a result of their "general question" method they "...were not able to put this...to the empirical test of repeated questioning" (Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck, 1961, p.173). The type of reliability which establishes consistency of response across questions was also not established because the variation in value orientations theory postulates that behavior, as assessed by the Value Schedule's questions, will not be consistent across different behavior spheres. Cross-item comparison for the same person was also prevented because the Value Schedule was not long enough to allow for any behavior spheres to be separated out within any one of the value orientations.

It was the hope of these authors that an interpretive analysis, which was provided by four separate culture analysts and included in the study, would provide some measure of reliability and validity for the measure and the theory. These same reliability problems are passed on to those studies which used the Value Schedule (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978; Brink, 1984; Caudill & Scarr, 1962; DuBray, 1985; Harrison, 1974; Mezei, 1974; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971). Similarly, the Value Orientation Questionnaire (VOQ) (Green & Haymes, 1973) lacks any known stability or internal consistency because the authors neglected to report or discuss any information concerning reliability of the measure. From all indications, there was no attempt to establish any reliability of any kind for this instrument.

Many of the reliability problems observed in the other studies were due to weak methods of establishing reliability, inconsistent reliability coefficients, inconsistent results obtained from the same identified culture, or low reliability scores. The pilot study of the Intercultural Values Inventory (ICV) by Carter in 1984 (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) computed Chronbach Alphas for the 15 value orientation alternatives or subscales, as referred to by the authors. The range was from .37—.73. An inter-item analysis helped revise the ICV (Carter & Helms, 1990) resulting in Chronbach Alphas ranging from .50—.79. with twelve of the fifteen

subscales below .70. The authors claim that these Chronbach Alphas suggest fair stability for the measure.

Chronbach Alphas are an index of internal consistency of test items necessary for the purpose of adding those items together to form a single score. The items must be homogeneous in order for the total score to be meaningful. When the reliability of a total score is not being sought and the purpose is to establish the internal consistency of several separate subscales, as was the case for the ICV, a Chronbach Alpha is an acceptable statistical procedure for obtaining a very general and nonspecific sense of the measures internal consistency. The Chronbach Alpha is a flawed statistic, however, because it is based upon a universal set of hypothetical items and biased by the length of the test. The Chronbach Alpha increases as the number of test items increase. As a result, it is possible to have an internally consistent, low-number-item test with a low Chronbach Alpha and at the same time have an internally inconsistent, high-number-item test with a high Chronbach Alpha.

In addition, it was discovered that studies by Carter & Helms (1987), Carter & Helms (1990), and Carter (1990), which employed the ICV to assess the same race or culture groups, yielded discrepant results. These same Chronbach Alphas were used as a basis for ICV stability in subsequent studies conducted by Carter & Helms (1987), Carter (1990) and Carter & Parks (1992).

The Value Orientation (VO) scale (Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979) yielded Chronbach Alpha reliabilities for Sample 1 of .72—.89 while Sample 2 yielded reliability coefficients of .46—.76. Sample 1 (Szapocznik et al., 1978) was the group on whom the VO scale was developed while Sample 2 was the group on whom the study was run. While Sample 1's internal consistency is moderate to strong, Sample 2's Chronbach Alphas are lower and offer questionable internal consistency for the measure. With such reliability inconsistency occuring, it appears that the VO scale may be unstable.

Keller and Bergstrom (1993) used the other, health-oriented Value Orientation Scale (VOS) developed by Murdaugh (1982). They reported test-retest coefficients of .32—.68 while theta coefficients ranged from .46—.72. Regular Chronbach Alphas were reported to be much lower. These results offer little support for strong reliability of this measure.

The only impressive reliability scores were demonstrated by Ibrahim and Kahn's Scale to Assess World Views (1987). Chronbach Alphas, split-half, and odd-even reliability coefficients range from .95—.98. These reliabilities accord strong stability to this measure; however, since this reliable scale measures world views its relevance to value orientations is in question.

It is unfortunate that a mean inter-item analysis was never employed to establish internal consistency for any of these measures. The mean inter-item correlation is a much better index of internal consistency because it measures the average correlation of any pair of items in the measure. Unlike the Chronbach Alpha, it is not biased by the number of items in the instrument. If the mean inter-item analysis had been employed, a clearer and firmer sense of internal consistency and stability for these measures would have been established. In addition, test-retest, split-half, and alternative measures reliabilities could have been employed to establish other types of reliability for these measures.

Another factor of paramount concern involves the validity of these five measures of value orientations (i.e., Value Schedule, ICV, VO scale, VOS, and VOQ) and the generalizability of the results obtained in studies which use these measures. Great suspicion about the validity of these instruments and generalizability of results is evoked by methodological neglect, theoretical pontification, unorthodox procedures, potential circular reasoning, testing environment and procedural effects, weaknesses in the theory behind the construction of the test, and, in one case, lack of empirical support for a value orientation. In addition, statistical procedures instituted by the studies under review (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978; Brink, 1984; Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992; Caudill & Scarr, 1962; DuBray, 1985; Green & Haymes, 1973; Harrison, 1974; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Keller & Bergstrom, 1993; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Mezei, 1974; Murdaugh, 1982; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971; Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979) were, for the most part, acceptable and appropriate as applied.

A variety of problems did emerge, however, in relation to the use of statistical procedures. These problems included different statistical procedures used with modified versions of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961), no rationale offered when a different

statistical procedure was used with the original Value Schedule, limited information on or rationale given for employed statistical procedures, poor presentation of statistical procedures and data, and the neglect of more sophisticated and informative statistical procedures.

Factorial validity was never established in the original Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) study. Their attempts to respond to the issue of validity involved the method of testing items simultaneously in several cultures demonstrating consistency of an item in some culture groups while at the same time being inconsistent in another group. The authors claim that such a methodology indicates that the inconsistency is a result of cultural differences, what the Value Schedule is intended to measure, rather than instability of the measure. Further, they suggest that such inconsistencies could also be attributed to intracultural variation resulting from movement in behavior spheres rather than instrument instability. Additional validity confirmation was sought from the interpretations of the culture analysts asked to analyze the results of the study and compare and contrast them with anthropological data.

The problem of definitional confusion, previously addressed when considering theoretical weaknesses, parallels the theoretical and empirical trap of circular reasoning addressed in Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961). This issue strikes at the heart of validity for the Value Schedule as well as any instrument purporting to measure cultural values. When considering the entire assessment process, it appears that this theory and the measures spawned from it may reinvent cultures and values already identified by anthropological discretion and stamp upon them the potentially artificial profile generated by a self-proclaimed measure of culture and values. Are these cultural analysts studying and analyzing the behavioral data of a culture, developing a supposed value system for that culture, and then attempting to use that value system to explain the behavioral data from which that value system came ? What rigorous criterion exists which can clearly demarcate a culture from just a group of people? Is culture an all or nothing status or are there degrees of culture? If degrees of culture do exist, how can they be measured reliably and validly? Each of these questions compel probing investigation of this cultural value orientations theory and the instruments presented to measure value orientations.

Additional validity concerns emerge in the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) study. In the

value orientations theory, it is suggested that value orientations are in part determined by spheres of behavior or contextual forces. This idea should also be applied to the examinee in the midst of the test-taking sphere of behavior. The authors need to consider if the context of the Value Schedule assessment process and environment yields one particular set of responses while a totally different context would result in a different set of responses.

This controversy yields questions about the essence of culture and whether it is state or trait oriented. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) appear to conceptualize values as being both state and trait oriented. In so doing, they incriminate the Value Schedule's method of assessment. Further, this study did not assess all the theorized value dimensions or alternatives within those dimensions. They reportedly dropped the Human Nature dimension (with the alternatives of Good, Bad, or Mixed) and the Being-in-Becoming alternative from the Activity dimension because of time and funding constraints. Therefore, the functional reliability or validity of these areas cannot be affirmed until they have been properly administered and their results analyzed and interpreted.

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) gave detailed reasoning for and outlining of the statistical procedures used to analyze their Value Schedule data. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) first used a Kendall S statistic to determine concensus among subject responses to establish within-culture regularity and total-item patterning. A binomial analysis was used to determine significant alternative preferences within culture as well as strength and direction of that preference. Then a t-test was employed to determine general preferences, total orientation patterning, and orientation popularity.

Mezei (1974) applied new statistical procedures to the original Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) data so as to uncover new information about the instrument's construct validity. The reasoning behind and the details of the procedure, however, were extremely limited. A principal axis factor analysis was performed on the Value Schedule with both quartirmax and varimax rotations. Forty variables were included which used the empirical rank orders that had been reported for the solutions. The solutions were rotated to Kiel-Wrigley critierion which is the point when the two highest loadings on one factor are reached. Each rotation yielded factors. This factor analysis accorded construct validity to

three of the value orientations but did not yield factoral construct validity for one of the orientations. As with reliability, many of the validity, methodology, and statistical weaknesses held by the Value Schedule are passed on to other studies which use the Value Schedule for their assessment and research (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978; Brink, 1984; Caudill & Scarr, 1962; DuBray, 1985; Harrison, 1974; Mezei, 1974; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971). A list of test items with factor loadings was not offered but reportedly available for purchase from a microfiche company.

Many of the studies which used the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) had their own methodological, validity, and generalizability weaknesses. These weaknesses included alterations to tests, specific sampling problems, neglect in providing pertinent information, and administration procedural problems. Those studies which employed the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) in a modified way (Caudill & Scarr, 1962; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971) analyzed the data with different statistics.

Caudill & Scarr (1962) made several alterations to the original Value Schedule instrument. In addition to dropping two value orientation dimensions, adding a Time Orientation question and making substitutions in the content material of the test, the authors added the new theoretical and empirical concept of cultural distance. With that many changes to the instrument, this measure may be a whole new Value Schedule which can only be superficially compared to the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) version and can share in none of the research support for the original Value Schedule. In fact, no reliability or validity information is offered for the distance assessment procedure or for their item by item comparison and analysis procedure. Therefore, the results from this study are tentative at best. Further, they only presented descriptive statistics and an item by item percentage distribution analysis of several subject responses and response patterns. More sophisticated, inferential statistics should have been employed to yield additional and more meaningful data.

Papajohn and Spiegel (1971) made use of the Value Schedule as a measure of acculturation and in general the measure appeared to perform adequately. Many aspects of this study's methodology, however, cast obscurity on the results. The sample was not randomized and half of the sample was chosen on the basis of having a relative hospitalized with a psychotic

condition. A rationale for such criteria, although possibly discernable, was not explained. There were a number of individuals administering the Value Schedule heightening the study's vulnerability to administration bias or confounds. The Werner Rorschach System was employed; however, the reliability and validity of that analysis procedure was never presented. Therefore, any correlations made between the Rorschach and the Value Schedule are meaningless until the stability and validity of both measures is known.

As far as the authors (Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971) use of statistical procedures, they used intra-group correlations employing sex and SES as criterion variables to explore the relationship between acculturation and psychological disturbance in second-generation Greek Americans. In addition, an analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the Americanization-score means with high and low Rorschach indices was conducted. A t-test comparison was used to uncover the principal contributing variables to the significant variance found among the four groups (sex x class) of the Rorschach high index.

A study of New Guinea inhabitants (Harrison, 1974) resulted in the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) being translated and adapted several times. The sample characteristics were widely divergent, consisting of some unculturated native men, some farming men, and high school students. The methodologies employed were discrepant as was the administration of the Value Schedule. Several interviews had to be discarded because respondent comprehension was low and the Hawthorne Effect may have occurred amongst the Kewa group as a result of inordinate community interest in the entire testing process. Validity and generalizability of results are curtailed by these vulnerabilities.

This study (Harrison, 1974) offered no real statistics but it is assumed that the same statistical procedures used in the Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961) study were employed here. Value orientation rank profiles of the Kewa, Ukarumpa and Goroka High School students, derived from the administration and analysis of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961), were presented. A discussion of the profile was cited but incompletely referenced and difficult to attain. That discussion and any pertinent statistical data should have been included in this study. At the very least, the statisticial procedures used in the Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961) study (i.e., Kendall S, binomial analysis, and t-test) should

have been implemented and reported.

The Hupa (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978) sample was specifically chosen by someone outside the study. Tribal members' participation was pre-arranged and not randomized. The sample was overrepresented by women who comprised 84% of the sample and was greatly divergent in age with a range of 52 years. The Value Schedule was administered under the direction of a Hupa tribal member who was, in all likelihood, unqualified to adequately perform the assessment. Sex bias was also revealed on two of the items. Once again, weaknesses in methodology lead to inconclusive and nongeneralizable results. The Kendall S, binomial analysis, and t-test procedures were also used with the data from this study. Reported data consisted mostly of t-test results. An analysis was also performed to identify any potential age or sex bias.

The Afaha Obong Clan subjects used in the Brink (1984) study were pre-selected by a government official and not randomized. Large discrepancies in age with a range of 40 years, discrepancies in the amount of education extending from no education to 2 years in the University, along with an overall small sample, limits the generalizability of this study. Reports by the author suggest that great variation occurred in the administration of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). The translation was not carefully or methodically prepared but was offered to respondents in an impromptu fashion while the Value Schedule was being administered. Such an administration could result in numerous confounding inconsistencies. These methodological weaknesses interfere with validation of the results obtained. Once again, this study employed a Kendall S, binomial analysis, and t-test procedures to analyze its data. A rank-ordered value orientations profile was generated for the Afaha Obong Annang based on the results obtained from the analysis.

DuBray (1985) used the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) with female social workers all of whom had the same level of education but with half being of American-Indian heritage and half of Anglo-American heritage. At first glance this appears to be a well controlled study; however, the American-Indian subjects came from 28 different tribes and neither of the samples were randomized. American Indian is a race and not a culture resulting in misuse of the Value Schedule and eliminating any validity. Generalizability is weakened

by the nonrandomized sample. This study used the original Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) unmodified but employed different statistical procedures. The assessment of American Indian and Anglo-American social workers employed an ANOVA to analyze the results and to identify the value orientations profile for each race. The ANOVA was also used to identify significant response and value orientation differences between the two races.

Studies using alternate measures of value orientations (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992; Green & Haymes, 1973; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Keller & Bergstrom, 1993; Murdaugh, 1982; Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979) also demonstrated methodological problems such as unorthodox and unwarranted methods of establishing validity, weakly established reliability, unstable reliability coefficients, sampling confounds, correlations with weak measures, unequal treatment of subjects, procedural confounds, unorthodoxed procedures, lack of empirical (factoral) support, construct terminology confusion, and neglect to provide pertinent information for evaluation. These problems impact the validity of the tests and the generalizability of the results.

These measures also used various statistical procedures to derive the type of data they sought. In the Carter and associates articles (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992) the adequacy of the explanations offered for choice of statistical procedures was varied. Some of these studies offered a sufficient explanation about the statistics used while others (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1990) lacked adequate information.

Carter in1984 (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) conducted a pilot study on the ICV (Kohls, 1984, cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) and seven of the fifteen subscales had Chronbach Alphas below .50. An inter-item analysis was performed, the ICV was revised (Carter & Helms, 1990), but the results were never reported. Twelve of the 15 revised subscales had Chronbach Alphas below .70. In addition, a factor analysis was never performed on the ICV. If it had been employed, some meaningful factors may have emerged which could have accorded this measure some construct validity. The only criterion offered for construct and predictive validity for the ICV by the authors was its ability to distinguish between and within culture value orientations. A handful of studies were offered as support for the ICV's ability to fufill that criterion. Thus, no true validity is established for this instrument.

In this original pilot study for the ICV (Carter & Helms, 1990), an inter-item analysis was conducted to identify low item/total subscale correlations for the purpose of revising the ICV and to help bolster its reliability and validity. Further, a series of 15 multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine if SES could predict value-orientation responses by a subject. The dependent variables used were race, mother's and father's educational level, mother's and father's occupational status, mother's and father's years on the job, student's educational level, and race x SES interactions for each SES variable. Reliability coefficients and summary of means with standard deviations were also presented. Preferably, these authors should have run a factor analysis on the ICV to determine if any significant factors might emerge which would empirically support the subscales and lend true construct validity to this measure.

In addition to the validity concerns for the ICV, the Carter and Helms' (1987) sample possessed some interesting characteristics which could be potentially confounding. The college cultural base from which the subjects of this study were obtained were extrememly discrepant. All the participants were Black, however, approximately 60% of them came from a predominantly White university while the rest came from an all Black university. In addition, there was an overrepresentation of women, comprising approximately 60% of the sample and only some of the respondents were academically rewarded for their participation. The study attempted to correlate ICV value orientations with RAIS racial identity attitudes. Yet, RAIS Chronbach Alpha reliabilities ranged from .66—.72 and were not any stronger than those reported for the ICV. No further attempts to establish validity on the ICV were made.

This study (Carter and Helms, 1987) used a variety of statistical procedures to assess the relationship between racial identity attitudes and value orientations. A series of multiple-regression analyses were employed with the RAIS as the independent variable and the ICV as the dependent variable. A repeated measures ANOVA was used across value orientation alternatives, the dependent variable, in order to explore the structure of the value orientations and to determine if sex differences, the independent variable, existed. Post hoc differences were examined using Tukey's HSD. There was an examination of beta weights for individual variables in the regression model.

The sample, in another Carter (1990) study, was overrepresented by Whites comprising 63% of the sample and underrepresented by Blacks who comprised the remaining 37% of the sample. Nine percent of the sample were Blacks attending an African-American community college. Only a portion of the sample was academically rewarded for their participation. Significant demographic differences were discovered between the two racial groups with Whites being of a younger age and of a higher SES status. Each of these issues could have impacted the results of this study. A discriminant function analysis was used to investigate the existence of differences between Black and White college students. Racial group membership was the identified criterion variable and the 15 value orientation alternatives were used to predict racial group membership. A preliminary one-way ANOVA was conducted to uncover any significant demographic differences between the two races.

The Carter and Parks' (1992) study also had numerous sampling problems. All respondents were college students. Women made up 68% of the sample while men accounted for the remaining 32%. Over 90% of the students were of a middle to upper-middle class background and there was an overrepresentation of Germans. There was limited and inadequate discussion about the reasoning of those respondents who identified their ethnicity as American. Numerous potential reasons could have generated such a response with each being a possible confounding source to the results of the study. A significant demographic difference in SES status was detected by a one-way ANOVA. All of these issues undermine the validity of the results obtained.

Carter and Parks (1992) used a variety of statistical procedures in their investigation of the relationship between cultural value orientations and identification of culture among White Americans. A discriminant analysis was conducted with cultural values as the discriminator variable. This type of analysis explores whether members of various previously existing groups can be accurately identified as belonging to those membership groups based on information about another variable(s). Standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients for specific values in the function were produced as a result of the discriminant analysis. They revealed the relative impact of each value orientation alternative in the function. A preliminary one-way ANOVA was conducted to investigate whether there were

any significant differences between culture groups for the demographics of age and sex.

Fluctuating Chronbach Alpha reliabilities for the VO scale (Szapocznik et al., 1978) suggested that this instrument was unstable and unreliable. In the measure's development, an overrepresentation of Cubans was used and the mean age of the subjects in Sample 1 was more than eight years older than the mean age of Sample 2. These two factors alone could greatly undermine the validity and generalizability of this instrument. In addition, there was twice as many women represented as men in both samples. Sample 2 was mostly comprised of adolescents who were patients receiving mental health treatment; however, the VO scale was developed and normed (Sample 1) on a nonpatient population. Further, the authors never seemed to have considered if the patients' psychopathology might confound their responses to the scale.

A special procedure was instituted in this study (Szapocznik et al., 1978) for the Activity value orientation of the VO scale which may have totally confounded the results. When no factors emerged which contained a sufficient number of Activity items, 120 Cuban and Anglo high school students were added to Sample 2. This was done to bolster the sample with the hopes of generating some significant results on the activity orientation. This entire procedure is artificial, unreliable, and invalid. No characteristics were offered about these additional 120 subjects and there was no mention of random inclusion. This scale was then pulled out from the entire instrument for separate analysis with no known reliability or validity of its own on which to stand.

Statistical information in these Cuban and Anglo studies (Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979) is generously offered but presented it in a lengthy, drawn-out and disjointed style. In the first study, the factor analysis of Sample 1, used in the development of the VO scale, involved an alpha solution and an oblique rotation. The oblique rotation is used when there is reason to believe the factors are related to each other in some way. Differences between Cuban and Anglo-American respondents (Sample 2) on the revised VO scale were determined with a two-tailed t-test. Sample 2 was also factor analyzed with an alpha solution and an oblique rotation.

Many of the first study's methodological and statistical weaknesses were passed onto a

follow-up study by Szapocznik et al.(1979) which had a very small sample (N=52), an underrepresentation of Cuban adult males, and statistically significant differences in SES status. The follow-up study used the same procedure as the previous study (Szapocznik et al., 1978); however, the subjects in this study were Cuban and Anglo-American adult psychiatric outpatients. Significant differences in value orientations between these two groups were determined with the use of a two-tailed t-test. The same statistical procedure used in the first study by these authors to investigate any significant differences in SES between the two groups was also used in this study.

Keller and Bergstrom (1993) used the VOS (Murdaugh, 1982) to assess Black women and to correlate the results with a measure for SES status. When the VOS was developed, Murdaugh (1982) used a sample composed of White, well-educated, middle to upper-middle class individuals. As previously mentioned, the reliability scores were low. The amount of variance accounted for by each of the factors was never reported. This instrument appears unstable and there appears to be little support for the construct validity of the instrument.

When Keller and Bergstrom (1993) used the measure, their sample was composed of Black women who were poorly to moderately educated and of a low SES status. In fact, nearly 8% of these women could not read. With such an extreme difference between this sample and the sample on which the VOS was developed, the possibility of obtaining accurate or meaningful results is greatly diminished. Theta coefficients were established for this study with a range of .60—.72. These reliabilities suggest increased internal consistency but do not quell concerns about the stability of the measure over time. These issues are sufficient to regard any results of this study with great suspicion and caution.

These authors (Keller and Bergstrom, 1993) offered no rationale as to their method of analysis and little more about the actual procedures themselves. The Keller and Bergstrom (1993) study sought to investigate the relationship between value orientations and demographic variables using the VOS, a measure developed by Murdaugh (1982). A principal components factor analysis with predictive modeling was conducted on the VOS (Murdaugh, 1982) and a rotation of the factors resulted in one meaningful factor emerging for each subscale variation. It was discovered, however, that many of the items on the VOS were not tapping

the concepts as theoretically predicted. In fact, only 40-80% of the test items were loading on the factors as hypothesized. Names or labels for the factors were not given and a list of test items with factor loadings was never offered. The study presented VOS mean scores and Pearson correlations to describe the relationship between value orientations and demographic variables.

The Scale to Assess World Views (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) was a measure based upon the same value orientations theory that was integral to the development of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Damage to the validity of the instrument occurred as a result of the manipulation of the value orientations construct. These authors removed the original construct's terminology (i.e., value orientations) and definition. They then replaced it with the term world views and gave it a different definition.

The Cronbach Alpha reliabilities computed for the pilot study (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) were moderate at .74 but the re-computed Alphas in the main study were very high at .98. Split-half and odd-even reliabilities also had high coefficients of .95 and .96, suggesting this instrument to be stable and consistent. The employment of a mean inter-item correlation would have been even more helpful and informative.

The sample used in the pilot study (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) for the development of the Scale was heavily overrepresented by women comprising 73 % of the sample but no other telling sample characteristics were offered. The main study was also overrepresented by women at 56%, Whites at 94%, suburbanites at 72%, and Catholics at 61%.

A factor analysis was conducted for the pilot study (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) and revisons were made to the scale; however, the authors never discussed the results of that factor analysis or gave any rationale for the revision made to the instrument. In fact, these authors did not refer to the factor analysis as a source of construct validity. Instead, they referred to the high concurrence obtained by their multi-judge item selection procedure as the source of construct validity for this instrument and study.

This multi-judge procedure is problematic because the return rate was very low at seventeen percent. Additionally, there was little explanation about the qualifications for such persons to be judges. The criteria for item inclusion only required 60% agreement among the judges. If

these authors were really interested in establishing construct validity for this scale, then they needed to firmly ground their study in previous relevant research, develop items with appropriate content, acquire a balanced and well-represented sample, develop strong structural fidelity of the instrument, establish strong reliability, perform and report a thorough factor analysis, and correlate the results of this instrument with other instruments which purport to measure the same construct.

Surveys of this type are superfluous and a waste of time. The definition and term differences noted above, along with these skewed samples, and the lack of viable construct validity results in significant concern about the validity of this measure. An abundance of technical details were offered when explaining the MDSCAL procedure (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) and analysis of the Scale to Assess World Values. Yet, a clear theoretical explanation and rationale for its implementation was never offered.

In the pilot study (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987), a principal components factor analysis with an oblique rotation was conducted on 161 subjects. It is interesting to note that this study, like the Szapocznik et al. (1978) study, used an oblique rotation but never mentioned if the factors were related or if the relationship between the factors were found to be orthogonal and independent as was found in Szapocznik et al. (1978). The authors claimed that the factor structure which emerged from the factor analysis suggested a multidimensional system. This signaled the reasoning behind the eventual use of the MDSCAL procedure which taps into intragroup variation. The number of factors which emerged or the names/labels applied to them were never revealed. Test items and factor loadings on those test items were never offered. The Scale was revised and re-administered to the 501 students of this study. The MDSCAL procedure was used to analyze the data so that the inter- and intragroup structure of the samples' world views could be identified. No clarification or explanation was offered for the MDSCAL procedure, related terminology, significance of the numerical data, or generated data statements.

Lastly, Green and Haymes (1973) had a large ($\underline{N}$=475) but narrow sample. All the subjects in this study were White, undergraduate, college students attending the same Mid-western university. The authors development of the VOQ was based upon the work of Kluckhohn and

Strodtbeck (1961). No reliabilities, of any kind, were reported for this instrument. Such negligence levels a severe blow to any potential validity offered on behalf of the VOQ. Until reliability is firmly established and it is clear that the measure is stable and consistent, issues of validity hold little meaning. In addition, these authors used a highly questionable sampling procedure in their attempts to establish validity for this measure.

The original study (Green and Haymes, 1973) sample was divided into two subsamples but there is no explanation as to how this sample was divided. The one smaller subsample was used to generate predictions for the second larger subsample studied six months later. These predictions were generated from the use of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The way in which the MANOVA was applied was not revealed. The authors reported that all results were replicated and statistically significant but no specific data is presented. The analysis and results reported, however, were based upon those two subsamples recombined. This procedure is confounding. What appears to be between group comparisons eventually becomes what are actually within group comparisons. Further, statistically significant gender and income differences were found which could affect the results of this study. A factor analysis was performed on this measure but there was nearly 75% unaccounted for variance left over. This confusion adds to the grave concerns already voiced about the reliability and validity of this measure and makes any results obtained highly suspect.

Second to the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) study, this study (Green and Haymes, 1973) was best at giving both a rationale and explanation of the statistics employed. These authors were investigating any relationship that might exist between value orientations, personality characteristics and marijuana use. An analysis of covariance was performed to control for extreme response styles and acquiescence bias. All additional analyses were performed on the entire sample with subsample 1 and subsample 2 combined.

The sample was divided along four levels of marijuana use. Two 2-way MANOVAs (Sex x Marijuana classification) were performed with the 15 VOQ scales and the 18 CPI scales as dependent variables. A hierarchical stepwise statistical comparison known as the Helmhert statistical method was used in analyzing marijuana-use-group differences. Brief analyses were conducted to uncover any significant differences due to demographics or gender. The data

was examined in different ways.

Raw and standardized value orientation means were presented by the study (Green and Haymes, 1973) for gender and for levels of marijuana use. These means were then rank-ordered according to degrees of respondent consensus and not rank-ordered by the respondent as in previous measures. The consensus determined rank-orderings imposed upon the data by these authors is a new and highly questionable procedure with no established reliability or validity.

A principal-axis factor analysis using BMDX72 was performed on the correlations among the 15 VOQ scales with squared multiple correlations as initial communality estimates. The factors were rotated obliquely to Oblimin criterion. The criterion to stop factoring was an eigenvalue of 1.0 or less. The 15 VOQ scales and an item addressing marijuana usage were included in a second factor analysis in order to determine which of those factors were associated with marijuana use.

The use of Factor Analysis in the research of value orientations is woefully neglected. A few studies (Green & Haymes, 1973; Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Mezei, 1974; Murdaugh, 1982; Szapocznik et al., 1978) employed a factor analysis in the construction of an instrument or in the analysis of data. A couple Carter and associates studies (Carter, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992) employed a discriminant or discriminant functions analysis which initially appeared to be a type of factor analysis but ended up being another less sophisticated type of statistical procedure. In addition to the use of a factor analysis in their pilot study, Ibrahim and Kahn (1987) used a multidimensional scaling procedure which initially appeared as a type of factor analysis but its purpose was to organize the subject reponses in order to assess intragroup variation, rather than assess the item clusters to assess construct validity. Overall, factor analyses were underused in this entire body of literature preventing strong construct validity from being established.

In some cases (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987; Mezei, 1974; Murdaugh, 1982; Szapocznik et al., 1978), when a factor analysis was employed, the information provided about the procedure was frequently limited. Unclear factor names, labels, and/or descriptions were a problem in some studies (Mezei, 1974; Szapocznik et al., 1978) while other studies (Ibrahim & Kahn,

1987; Murdaugh, 1982) offered no names or labels for factors which emerged. None of these articles ever included a list of test items or factor loadings for those items. Two studies (Mezei, 1974; Szapocznik et al., 1978) offered this information by request and/or purchase through the mail. A list of test items and factor loadings are important information in verifying the item clusters and the ascribed decriptions, names or labels. Such information should always be included within the report of the study.

Finally, the use and treatment of the factor analysis results were often unexplained and arbitrary. In some case, the factor analysis was used to offer construct validity to a theory and/or instrument (Mezei, 1974; Murdaugh, 1982) while Ibrahim and Kahn (1987) used it to revise their instrument. In two studies (Green & Haymes, 1973; Szapocznik et al., 1978), the factor analysis seemed to be used to identify additional special assessment features of the instrument which allowed enhanced understanding of subject item endorsements. In all research, a clear explanation as to the purpose of a factor analysis should be stated and followed.

Results and Conclusions

The results and conclusions generated from all these studies must be acknowledged and interpreted with caution. The critique of these articles presents numerous methodological and some statistical weaknesses which undermine the reliability, validity, and in some cases the generalizability of the results and conclusions obtained. The jury is still out on these results until further, more rigorous studies can be conducted and more reliable and valid instruments can be developed. Therefore, a presentation of the most central results and conclusions for each study will be offered with the understanding that these results and conclusions are what each author believes to be true and not what may be actually true. Further, it will be the policy of this paper when reporting the authors' conclusions to only report derived dominant values and not the corresponding variant values of a culture so as to avoid confusing within and between-culture intricacies. The importance of the interactive dynamics concept (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) between the ranked values is affirmed, but its discussion and application is beyond the scope of this paper.

Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) reported three firm conclusions which they claimed

evolved from the results of this study: 1) "...hypothesized within-culture regularities in the rankings of the alternatives of the orientations did emerge" (p. 171); 2) "...the observed results agree well, although certainly not fully, with the predictions we ventured to make prior to the administration of the schedule to the five samples of respondents" (p. 172); and 3) "...the theoretically postulated between-culture differences in ranking patterns of preferences among the alternatives of the orientations were also an observed result..." (p. 172). The most significant results include: a) the Spanish-American culture which is the most distinctive by displaying the most outstanding between-culture differences; b) the great similarity between the Mormon and Texan, English-speaking communities which together present a polarity to the Spanish American culture; and c) the in-between position of the two Indian groups which were distinctly different from each other on approximately half of the comparisons.

Dominant value orientation preferences derived from the study were reported as follows: Spanish-Americans = nonsignificance (n.s.)/Relational, Present/Time, Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature, and Being/Activity; Texan = Individualistic/Relational, Present & Future/Time, Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature, and Doing/Activity; Mormon = Individualistic/Relational, Present & Future/Time, Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature, and Doing/Activity; Zuni = Collateral/Relational, Past & Present/Time, n.s./Man-Nature, and n.s./Activity; and Navaho = Collateral/Relational, Present/Time, n.s./Man-Nature, and Doing/Activity. It is important to note that this study is dated by over thirty years and that these cultures have continued to evolve during that time. Therefore, even with all the methodological and statistical problems aside, additional caution is needed with regards to the results of this study because of the datedness of the data.

Mezei's (1974) factor analysis of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) performed a quartimax rotation which yielded two bipolar factors of an activity-passivity continuum and an individualistic-traditional dimension. The varimax rotation yielded seven factors which refined the original Man-Nature, Activity, and Relational orientation but scattered the Time orientation. Those seven factors were identified as follows: F1 = economic, F2 = community relations, F3 = a combination of two Collateral/Relational items and one Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature item, F4 = opposing three Individual/Relational

solutions with three Past/Time items, F5 = activity versus passivity, F6 = activity factor, and F7 = wasn't identified. The study concluded that the three problem areas of Man-Nature, Activity, and Relational are accorded construct validity while the Time problem area is not.

The Caudill and Scarr (1962) study, like Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), is dated by some thirty years. This heightens the caution that should be accorded to the results presented. Initial results considered the consensus of responses on individual items and accompanying variants followed by interpretations. They reported that a statistically significant consensus was found for all 18 value orientation alternatives. A generalized pattern was formulated, as observed from a number of items, suggesting that as the distance between the dominant value orientation and the other value orientations increases, the proportion of the sample endorsing the other value orientations decreases.

Relational orientation results of the study (Caudill & Scarr, 1962) reveal that 72% of the Japanese respondents held dominant Collateral/Relational values, an apparent rejection of a first-rank Lineality/Relational value. Conflict between the Collateral and Individualistic/ Relational orientations exists in the decision making process at both the village level and political sphere in postwar Japan. Future/Time orientation is reportedly the preference in technological matters while Present/Time orientation reigns in other, mostly social, areas of life. Mastery-over-Nature is the most popular Man-Nature alternative.

The average proportion of value transmission from parent to child for any one item was statistically significant at 42%. The most typical and notable changes in values were from: a) a parent's Lineality/Relational to a child's Individualistic and Collateral/Relational; b) a parent's Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature to a child's Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature; and c) a parent's Future/Time to a child's Present/Time.

The results of the Papajohn and Spiegel (1971) study are reported to reveal a complex interrelationship of social class, gender, and culture change as they relate to psychological stress among Greeks. Lower-class females had the highest significant correlation which suggests that their adoption of American values is related to scoring on the developmentally high Rorschach index and a highly significant negative correlation which indicates that movement towards adopting American values is related to the absence of cognitive-perceptual

disturbance. Middle-class females exhibited a nonsignificant, positive correlation between Americanization scores and high Rorschach index while a weak positive correlation was observed between Americanization scores and low Rorschach index. The results just mentioned for middle-class females must be acknowledged with further caution, however, as no probability (p) values were presented for the results obtained. Lower-class males displayed a negative correlation between Americanization scores and high Rorschach index and a positive correlation between Americanization scores and low Rorschach index. Middle-class males revealed a positive correlation between Americanization scores and both high and low Rorschach indices.

An ANOVA of this study (Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971) performed on the Americanization scores and high and low Rorschach indices yielded the ability to differentiate between the four groups at a .10 level of significance. Middle-class females were the only group whose r values were consistent with the mean values for position on the acculturation continuum. Lower-class males had the highest mean value on the high Rorschach index followed by middle-class females. As was previously noted, lower-class males' adoption of American values is negatively correlated to a high Rorschach index and positively related to a low Rorschach index. The implication is that lower-class males who adopt American values are subject to the greatest amount of psychological stress. Lower-class females have the next lowest mean value on the high Rorschach index and a relatively high mean value on the low Rorschach index.

This study (Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971) revealed that adoption of American values, as noted by the Americanization measure, significantly increases lower-class females healthy personality organization as evidenced by the Rorschach performance. The intercorrelational analysis evidenced that only those middle-class males who adopt core American values are characterized by high cognitive-perceptual modes while upwardly-mobile-middle-class males who do not adopt American core values have low-integrative-cognitive-perceptual modes.

Dominant values for natives of New Guinea was the focus of the Harrison (1974) study. Within-culture regularities and between culture differences were discovered. The Kewa

preferences were for Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature, Present/Time, Doing/Activity, and Lineal/Relational while the Ukarumpa preferred Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature, Present/Time, Doing/Activity, and Collateral/Relational. The Goroka high school students dominant value preferences were revealed with an orientation of Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature, Present/Time, Doing/Activity, and Collateral/Relational.

Hupa Indian (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978) results revealed significant cultural regularities among all four value orientations assessed. Dominant value preferences were reported as Doing/Activity, Collateral and Individualistic/Relational, Present/Time, and Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature. No age bias was found and the only sex bias occurred on 2 of 23 items.

The Afaha Obong Annang tribe (Brink, 1984) achieved consensus for all Relational value orientation items, all Time items except for T5, Activity items 4 and 6, and Man-Nature items 1, 2, and 3. The dominant values profile which emerged for this group was Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature, Present/Time, Being/Activity, and Collateral/Relational.

A univariate ANOVA of the four dependent variables of the Value Schedule for American Indian and Anglo-American social workers (DuBray, 1985) revealed statistically significant differences on the Relational, Time, and Man-Nature orientations but r › difference on the Activity orientation. The American Indian dominant value preferences were Being/Activity, Collateral/Relational, Present/Time, and Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature. The Anglo-American profile was Being/Activity, Individualistic/Relational, Present and Future/Time, Mastery-over-Nature and Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature.

Carter's 1984 study (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) found that eight of fifteen ICV subscales significantly differentiated between Blacks and Whites. Dominant values endorsed by Black students which were significantly different from White students responses were Evil/Human Nature, Subjugated-to-Nature/Man-Nature and Past/Time. White students' responses revealing dominant values that were significantly different from Black student responses were Collateral and Individual/Relational and Being/Activity. The within-group variables of socioeconomic status, gender, and racial identity attitudes were used to assess cultural value differences for Blacks, Whites and Asians (Carter & Helms, 1990).

Regarding socioeconomic status, Carter (1984) did not find any relationship between

> socioeconomic status and cultural values for Blacks or Whites. A series of 15 multiple regression analyses was conducted to address the question of whether one's socioeconomic status predicted one's value-orientation solutions. (Carter & Helms, 1990, p.13).

Carter and Helms' (1987) use of a series of multiple regression analyses revealed that racial identity attitudes, as measured by the RAIS, predicted Harmony-with-Nature/Person(Man)-Nature, Doing/Activity, and Collateral/Relations. Repeated measures analysis revealed significant differences on all five value-orientations. Black respondents as a whole preferred Good and Mixed/Human Nature, Harmony-with-Nature/Person(Man)-Nature, Doing/Activity, Individualistic/Relational and Future/Time. RAIS Internalization attitudes were found to be significantly and positively related to a belief in Harmony-with-Nature/Person-Nature and Doing/Activity. Immersion/Emersion and Internalization attitudes were positively related to Collateral/Relations. Some sex differences were also discovered. Black women were found to have significantly higher scores on Subjugation-to-Nature/Person-Nature and Present/Time.

A discriminant funtion analysis of the ICV (Carter, 1990) revealed significant differences between Blacks and Whites on eight of fifteen value orientation alternatives. The criterion variable used for this analysis was racial group membership. No factors were reported or names/labels given to any factors. Neither test items or factor loadings for test items were offered. Only a Chi square was reported and the authors claim that the results ($\underline{X}_2$ (15) = 138.32, $p<.001$) suggest that White Americans and African Americans differed in value orientation preferences. Black-American dominant value preferences were revealed as Evil/Human Nature, Subjugation-to-Nature/Person(Man)-Nature, Past/Time, Being-in-Becoming/Activity, and Lineal/Relational. White-American value preferences were Collateral and Individualistic/Relational and Being/Activity. A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant demographic differences for age and social class.

When comparing the results of Black-American responses on the ICV for Carter's 1984 study (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) with results obtained from Black-American respondents on the ICV in Carter and Helms (1987), significant differences in endorsed values are revealed. Carter's 1984 study (cited in Carter & Helms, 1990) reveals a profile for Black Americans

which includes Evil/Human Nature, Subjugation-to-Nature/Person-Nature, Past/Time, Being-in-Becoming/Activity, and Lineal/Relations. Carter and Helms (1987), however, revealed a profile for Black Americans which included Good and Mixed/Human-Nature, Harmony-with-Nature/Person-Nature, Future/Time, Doing/Activity, and Individual/Relations. This extreme discrepancy underscores the concern with this instrument's reliability and validity.

Differing cultural value orientations between first, second and later-generation White-ethnics were found to be in existence according to the result of a study by Carter and Parks (1992). A discriminant analysis produced five functions and the first function accounted for 40% of the variance while the first three functions accounted for 86% of the variance. The first function did significantly discriminate among the six ethnic groups ($\underline{R}_c$ = .299; $\underline{X}$=.789; $\underline{X}_2$ (75, $\underline{N}$=434) = 99.93, $\underline{p}$ = .028). No factors were mentioned and no names/labels for factors were given. Test items or factor loadings for test items were never offered. Italians and Mixed Europeans who were individuals of mixed European heritage or those identifying with a group not broadly represented in this sample, were most distinctly identified by the first function and on the basis of cultural values. Those individuals who identified their ethnicity as American had the most distinct value preferences at the opposite end of the spectrum. The Irish, Polish, and Germans were weakly associated with the first function. A criteria for coefficient importance ($\underline{c}$ > +/- .35) was established but the authors never explained how that criteria was determined. From all appearances, it was arbitrary.

The study (Carter & Parks, 1992) revealed that Italians, Mixed Europeans, and Irish dominant value preferences were Good/Human Nature, Lineal/Relational, Past/Time, and Harmony-with-Nature/Person-Nature. On the other hand, Americans, Germans, and Polish display dominant value preferences of Present/Time and Doing and Being/Activity. A oneway ANOVA revealed that significant SES demographic differences did exist amongst these groups.

Cuban dominant value preferences, as measured by the VO scale (Szapocznik et al., 1978), were found to be Lineal/Relational for interpersonal relations, Subjugation-to-Nature/ Person(Man)-Nature and Present/Time. Anglo dominant value preferences, on the other hand,

were found to be Individualistic/Relational for interpersonal relations, Mastery-over-Nature/Person(Man)-Nature and Future/Time.

A factor analysis of Sample 1 yielded four factors described as follows: F1 = relational on a continuum between Individualistic to Lineal consistent with the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) Relational orientation; F2 = a mixture of mostly Relational items and some Man-Nature, Activity, and Human-Nature items resulting in idealized humanistic values for high scorers and personal concern for low scorers; F3 = mixed relationship between Man-Nature and Time orientations with a polarity between Mastery-over-Nature + Future orientation (i.e., engaging of life) and a Subjugation-by-Nature + Present orientation (i.e., fatalistic of life); F4 = Human qualities and impulses consistent with Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck (1961) Human Nature orientation with a polarity between a selfish, maliscious, and evil view of people versus a good but corruptible view of people. Percentage of variance accounted for by each factor is as follows: F1 = 5.31%, F2 = 3.50%, F3 = 3.21%, and F4 = 2.5%. These four factors together, however, accounted for only 14.25% of the total variance leaving 85.75% of the variance still unexplained.

The results revealed a factor structure which was orthogonal and factors independent of each other. The highest intercorrelation between factors was between Factors 2 and 3 computed at .160. Items that loaded greater than .30 onto one of the four factors were the items which comprise the VO scale. The authors claimed they achieved factorial validity for this instrument. A list of test items and factor loadings were not included in the article and were only available from the authors. No response was recieved from a request for that information.

The factor analysis of Sample 2 uncovered the first three of four factors in Sample 1 reemerging in Sample 2. The authors note that these three factors had the higher eigenvalues in Sample 1 and that Factor 4, which did not reemerge in the Sample 2 factor analysis, had the lowest eigenvalue. The amount of variance accounted for by Sample 2 factors was not reported.

Concurrence within this study (Szapocznik et al., 1978) between Sample 1 and Sample 2 factors was as follows: Factor 1 = 82% concurrence, Factor 2 = 54% concurrence, and Factor 3 =

67% concurrence. Statistically significant differences occurred between the Cubans and Anglos for Factors 1 and 3 of the VO scale-Sample 1 and for Factors 1-3 of Sample 2. An unexpected difference was reported for Sample 2. Anglo-Americans tended to endorse idealized humanistic values (F2) whereas Cubans tended not to endorse that factor. This same effect did not appear on Sample 1 and it was reasoned that it was the result of the age difference between the samples. The unorthodox procedure of adding the 120 high school students to the sample to generate data for the Activity orientation resulted in a dominant value preference of Doing/Activity for the Cubans and a Being/Activity for the Anglos. The overall results of this study confirmed four of the five hypotheses generated by the authors.

The replication and follow-up study (Szapocznik et al., 1979) which used an outpatient adult population and a two-tailed t-test for analysis found significant differences for the Relational, Temporal/Time, Person-Nature, and Human-Nature dimensions of the VO scale. The humanistic value factor observed among Anglo youths in the previous study was not found. Yet, a significant difference in SES status between these groups was found. Dominant value preferences for Cubans were Lineal/Relational, Subjugation-to-Nature/Person(Man)-Nature, Present/Time and Good/Human-Nature. The dominant value preferences observed for Anglo-Americans, on the other hand, were Individualistic/Relational, Mastery-over-Nature/Person(Man)-Nature, Future/Time and Evil/Human Nature.

The other VOS (Murdaugh, 1982) used by Keller and Bergstrom (1993) found that among their sample of Black female subjects Evil/Human Nature and Individualistic/Relational were inversely correlated with an increase in age. Further, Present/Time and Being/Activity were inversely related to an increase in the number of years of education while Being-in-Becoming/Activity was positively correlated with an increase in the number of years of education. Three significant factors in each major subscale arose from a factor analysis of the four value orientations. Modest correlations between the VOS and demographic characteristics were observed but no clearly defined value orientation patterns were observed among the respondents.

Ibrahim and Kahn's (1987) use of the MDSCAL procedure to analyze the Scale to Assess World Views yielded a five dimension solution achieved in 16 iterations. The five dimensions

possessed a total variance of 1.023 with a mean of .205 and a median of .088. The reported stress value was .047. No names or labels were generated for the dimensions. The five dimension solution yielded by MDSCAL revealed elements of relatedness and distinctness, indicating that these dimensions are tapping into intragroup variations, particularly among the White students who compose 94% of the sample. How these dimensions were related and how they were distinct was never explained.

A centered, normalized, and varimax rotation was conducted on the values in this study (Ibrahim and Kahn's, 1987) for dimensions 1-5 to determine the empirically derived dimensions or world views of this sample. Graphic representations for the five dimensions on 15 individual plots were not included but reportedly available from the authors. A list of test items with dimension loadings was never presented in this article, but item numbers accompanied value orientation alternatives which were listed under the five dimensions in a table format.

In many instances, the results of this study (Ibrahim & Kahn, 1987) came out in categorical/conceptual clumps and with greater variation, in part, due to the MDSCAL procedure. Human Nature was a conglomeration of Good, Bad, and/or Good and Bad on four of the dimensions. Relational was Collateral on three dimensions while a Lineal-Individualistic combination occurred for two dimensions. Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature was predominant for four of the five dimensions while Future/Time was found on two dimensions. Being-in-Becoming/Activity had a slightly stronger endorsement than Doing/Activity. The results of this study seem to be at variance with the results and claims that Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) reported, particularly for Whites. Ibrahim and Kahn (1987) conclude that this is a result of White cultural transition.

The development of the VOQ (Green & Haymes, 1973) and its implementation in a study of marijuana users and nonusers yielded various results. Significantly different scale scores on the VOQ and CPI occurred when group differences in marijuana use were reported. VOQ results revealed a Future/Time and a Being-in Becoming/Activity orientation for all groups. The dominant value orientations profile found for frequent users of marijuana was Present/Time, Good/Human Nature, Individualistic/Relational, Being/Activity, and Harmony-with-

Nature/Man-Nature while the dominant values profile for adamant nonusers of marijuana was Past/Time, Bad/Human Nature, Lineal/Relational, Doing/Activity and Subjugation-by-Nature/Man-Nature.

A factor analysis of the 15 VOQ scales yielded two, completely independent and orthogonal factors accounting for 23% of the variance. Factor 1, which accounted for 16% of the overall variance, was identified as traditional values. A work-success ethic, a future time perspective which respects and is comfortable with the past, and authority and/or age-oriented relations comprise this factor which accounts for 73% of the common variance shared between the two factors. Factor 2, which accounted for 7% of the overall variance, was described as unconstrained self-expression tempered by a desire to live in harmony with natural forces. A full 77% of the overall variance was unexplained. A second factor analysis involving the 15 VOQ scales and a marijuana usage factor was performed. This factor analysis resulted in no changes to the original factor structure with the same number of factors and the same amount of variance. Neither factor analysis offered a list of test items or factor loadings on those items.

It was discovered that marijuana user and nonuser determination was most closely associated with F1. The users are anti-Factor 1 and adamant nonusers are pro-Factor 1. Women were found significantly less likely to be frequent or occassional users of marijuana but these gender differences were only acknowledged and not discussed because the authors claimed it was not relevant to the focus of the study. Income was also found to be a significantly differentiating demographic factor. The California Personality Inventory was also administered offering additional data about the personalities of adamant nonusers and frequent users of marijuana.

These conclusions illustrate the flexibility of the value orientations construct and the value orientations theory. This theory and its subsequent measures have been used to distinguish value orientations and variations of those value orientations for races, ethnicities, religions, regions, tribes, genders, adolescents, college students, adults, people with specific occupations and participants of specific behaviors.

Yet, after all these studies are considered and analyzed, several questions come to mind.

First, who can make use of these conclusions? In general, these conclusions should be of interest to the actual participants in these studies, mental health and medical practitioners, researchers of values and cross-cultural relations, organizational psychologists and developers, negotiators, diplomats, government officials, teachers, professors, school developers and counselors, and anyone working with any of these groups or similar types of groups. In theory, this value orientations construct is universally applicable but the weak research conducted so far does not support that assumption empirically. Thus, these conclusions are of interest but should not be generalized and should only be applied to the actual participants in their respective studies.

Secondly, what conclusions can be used from this study? Direct application of any of the specific results obtained from these studies must be avoided or should only be performed with extreme risk; however, this is not to say that these studies do not offer any new information. Some of the best information obtained from this body of research comes en masse as a result of looking beyond the content and observing the process level of research. Much of this information has implications for the conceptualization of the value orientations construct and value orientations theory.

Each of these studies offer, at the very least, case study support for the existence of a value orientations construct and, in part, the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) value orientations theory. They also offer some level of support for the functional potential of the five instruments which claim to measure value orientations. Empirical support is offered by studies which performed factor analyses of the instruments (Green & Haymes, 1973; Mezei, 1974; Szapocznik et al., 1978) or by the MDSCAL analysis conducted by Ibrahim and Kahn (1987) which offered dimensional parameters to the variations displayed within the assessed group. These analyses identified that the value orientations construct does exist and that there is an empirical purpose to this type of research.

Correlational studies (Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990; Green & Haymes, 1973; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971) suggest that a viable construct does exist with which other variables may have a relationship. Some studies (Caudill & Scarr, 1962; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971; Szapocznik et al., 1978) made predictions or stated hypotheses based on

historical and anthropological data which were followed by empirical support of many of those predictions and hypotheses. The simultaneous assessments of different groups (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992; DuBray, 1985; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979) yielding different value orientations suggest that these value orientation instruments are measuring something which changes, not from time or time alone, but from inherent differences between the groups measured.

Aspects of the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) value orientations theory, such as variations in value orientations and the influence of spheres of behavior, have also found empirical support. Ibrahim and Kahn's (1987) MDSCAL procedure yielded five dimensions of variation among the value orientations of the group being assessed. This strongly homogeneous group revealed five different clusterings of responses by the respondents suggesting the existence of variation within the confines of a possible culture. The spheres of behavior concept was awarded some credibility by the Green and Haymes' (1973) study which revealed a relationship between a certain degree of behavior (i.e., marijuana use) and specific value orientations held.

Numerous other variables such as racial identity attitudes, gender, income, SES, personality characteristics, age, and years of education discovered in several of these studies (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992; Green & Haymes, 1973; Keller & Bergstrom, 1993; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971; Szapocznik et al., 1979) were found to be significantly associated to the measured value orientations construct. These significant associations indicate that there is something with which these variables can be related and that <u>something</u>, quite probably, is the <u>value orientations construct</u>. On the other hand, such variables could lead to modifications to the value orientations construct and/or theory and to the instruments which measure them. Factors which emerged from factor analyses (Green & Haymes, 1973; Mezei, 1974; Szapocznik et al, 1978) pose the same potential threat. Yet, it is also possible that these variables won't change the construct or the theory but rather, support the construct and/or theory while enhancing and broadening what is already known. Future research holds these answers.

The expansibility of the theory and measures are revealed by the proposed distance

concept introduced by Caudill and Scarr (1962) and the use of the Value Schedule by Papajohn and Spiegel (1971) as a measure of acculturation. Further, if flexibility in test use or format is a sign of the construct's and theory's expansibility, then all the studies presented offer support to this feature.

This research has also shown the potential for generating complex results which lead to very specific applications. With tighter research, the Papajohn and Spiegel (1971) study could have demonstrated that lower-class and some middle-class Greek male immigrants may require stress reduction treatment and/or assistance in acculturation. This type of information and subsequent applications are desired but must be withheld for the time being.

Not all the conclusions uncovered are positive or supportive of the value orientations construct, value orientations theory, or the instruments used. Specific use of the generated profiles must be prevented. Poor methodological rigor has prevented such direct interpretation and application. These profiles may be considered in a general way amongst a network of other sources and data about these groups.

Other limitations to the construct, theory, and instruments have emerged. The Carter and Parks (1992) study uncovered similar value orientation profiles for some ethnic groups. It is unclear if these are real similarities or signs of an instrument, construct and/or theory which is unable to adequately distinguish value differences between cultures. Other studies (Brink, 1984; Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990; Keller & Bergstrom, 1993) suggest weakness of the instrument, construct and/or theory from an inability to establish consensus of item patternings on specific items, alternatives, and orientations or an inability of the measure to distinguish value orientation differences for all the alternatives. Further, two ICV studies (Carter, 1984, cited in Carter & Helms, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1987) which both measured Black college students yielded highly discrepant results.

The actual construction of the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) and subsequent instruments are flawed when considering the value orientations definition offered at the outset of this paper by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961), themselves. Value orientations were reported to be composed of three elements—the cognitive, the affective, and the directive. Yet, all these measures of value orientations are paper and pencil tests which,

from an experiential standpoint, basically limit themselves to the realm of the cognitive. Therefore, two equally important elements to value orientations are left unassessed. Further, it's important to note that these measures of value orientations are, at most, possibly capable of measuring the value orientations of the group brought to it, and are in no way able to define or distinguish a culture. In all these studies, a presumed and preconceived organization of a particular culture was in place, whether or not it was truly a culture or some other conglomeration of related or unrelated people. Even when some of these studies (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992; DuBray, 1985; Green & Haymes, 1973; Papajohn & Spiegel, 1971; Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979) attempted to use the instrument to distinguish the difference between groups, those groups were already formed and a partial or complete formulation of the values held by those groups was in place.

A cross-comparison of some of these studies (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1990; Carter & Parks, 1992; DuBray, 1985; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961; Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979) reveals some consistency in the value orientation profiles generated for White Americans. The typical profile for this group includes: Individualistic/Relational orientation with some movement in the direction of Collateral/Relational, Present and Future/Time, Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature orientation with an occasional move towards Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature, and Doing and Being/Activity which may possibly be more reflective of an overall Being-in-Becoming/Activity. The absence of clear-cut definitive results are due to indecisive measures, use of different instruments, sampling errors, overly-broad orientation alternatives, or evolving culture.

The Spanish-Americans of the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) study and the Cubans of the two Szapocznik and associates studies (Szapocznik et al., 1978; Szapocznik et al., 1979) shared Present/Time and Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature in their value orientations profiles.

Some consistencies were also observed in studies assessing American Indians (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978; DuBray, 1985; Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961). Common value orientation alternatives endorsed by American Indians were Doing/Activity orientation with some instances of Being/Activity, Collateral/Relational orientation with some instances of

Individualistic/Relational, and Present/Time orientation with some instances of Past/Time. The inconsistencies that occurred were usually the result of comparing a particular tribe to the group of American-Indian social workers which consisted of a mixture of tribes.

The Hupa (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978) endorsed Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature while the social worker mixed group (DuBray, 1985) endorsed Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature. Further, the Navaho (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) and the Hupa (Bachtold & Eckvall, 1978) endorsed the Doing/Activity, but the social worker mixed group (DuBray, 1985) endorsed the Being/Activity. These inconsistencies may be attributed to the professional nature of the social worker group, the mixed nature of the social worker group, sampling problems, assessment of race rather than culture, or instrument differences.

Black Africans and Black Americans (Brink, 1984; Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1987, 1990) only shared the value orientation alternative of Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature. Two studies (Carter, 1990; Carter & Helms, 1990) demonstrated Black-American consistency on the value orientation alternatives of Evil/Human-Nature, Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature, and Past-Time, while another study (Carter & Helms,1987) revealed inconsistencies. The Black-American respondents of this study significantly endorsed Good and Mixed/Human-Nature, Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature, and Future/Time. Additionally, it was found that Black-American respondents endorsed Doing/Activity and Individualistic/Relational on one study (Carter & Helms, 1987) while on another study (Carter,1990) they endorsed Being-in-Becoming/Activity and Lineal/Relational. The inconsistencies found amongst these Carter and associates studies which all used the ICV are troublesome because they offer evidence of the instability of this measure.

Applying the Research

The purpose of this paper and the research question asked was: What relevant clinical applications can be generated from a thorough review and critique of the theoretical and empirical literature pertaining to cross-cultural value orientations? Proper and precise clinical applications of psychological research is of paramount importance. It is equally important to know when to refrain from making precise applications. Specific applications

implication is that these issues should be investigated and, when necessary, proper interventions be implemented.

General applications offered by Carter and Helms (1987) included the recommendation that racial identity attitudes and gender be considered when attempting to identify the value orientations of a client, instructions to develop and use culturally sensitive interventions, and the consideration of racial-identity attitudes as possible predictors of Afro-centric value orientations. Carter (1990) also suggested that educators and education facilities acquire knowledge about each student's value orientations in order to facilitate their understanding of the student's concept of the world and thereby, assist the student in lessening the potential anxiety and frustration which might arise in interpersonal and intergroup relationships.

Carter and Parks (1992) indicated that understanding the value orientations of an ethnic group is a beginning, but only a beginning, to understanding the value orientations of a client. Their study revealed that second-generation, White ethnics could be identified by some value orientations typically accorded to that ethnic group while other value orientations were not consistent with value orientation patterns documented for those cultures by other studies. More specific measures need to be taken by a clinician when working with someone from a different culture so as to understand the specific variant value orientations held by that person and not to stereotype their behavior from overgeneralized cultural summaries. Psychotherapists were given the recommendation to explore value orientations which contribute to their personal and professional functioning. These would include value orientations held by their culture, family of origin, spouse, friends, associates, and all value orientations which they have internalized.

The differences between Cuban and Anglo adolescents (Szapocznik et al., 1978) led the authors to suggest the development of mental health treatment approaches which match the idiosyncratic styles of the client. More specifically, a Cuban treatment approach that would fit with a typical Cuban value orientation would involve the client's social hierarchy because of their Lineal/Relational orientation. A therapist that functions within this orientation may take on the role of an authority figure and leader in the therapy sessions. Further, inclusion of the client's family in the therapy process would likely play an important role in treatment, too. The Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature alternative, typically a part of

from this body of literature are not easily generated because the results and conclusions obtained from these studies are highly suspect as a result of theoretical, methodological, and statistical problems. Several of the authors have offered their own applications in accord with their own particular study. Highlights of those applications will be offered with the assumption that the results upon which they are based are suspect. Additional potential applications will be offered and considered.

Statements made throughout Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) analysis of data reveal their belief in the powerful effect and prominence of value orientations in individual and societal functioning. For example they state "...there is no aspect of human behavior which is not influenced to some degree, either directly or indirectly, by culture. Basic values are a particularly pervasive cultural factor of influence" (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961, p. 364). These authors believe that values and value orientations should hold a prominent position in the overall understanding of the human psyche. They also claim that value orintations strongly influence both social and personality systems. When considering the more specific relevance of value orientations to human personality, they state:

> These statements lead directly to the use of the theory in studies of variations in individual personalities. Value-orientation preferences which the child, in being socialized in one cultural tradition as opposed to another, has subtly built into his total apperceptive mass through the role expectations imposed upon him are an extremely important aspect of his total personality. (p. 365)

A continunig discussion as to the powerful influence and effect of value orientations leads Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck (1961) to consider the impact upon the psychotherapeutic relationship. In reference to another study, the authors (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) reveal their concern by stating:

> ...the value-orientation factor has loomed so large... that a serious question has been raised as to the magnitude of the therapy problem which is created because the patients of these groups and their middle-class American therapists are so disparate in their value-orientation preferences (p. 366).

Although no offical or direct applications are made by the authors from these statements, the

Cuban value orientations, could mean that the client is sensitive to environmental social pressures and tensions. Effective treatment would, likely, function from an ecological framework and may assist the Cuban client in restructuring his interactions with sources of social pressure. The Cuban Present/Time value orientation could possibly lead to a crisis-orientation-style of functioning which should be anticipated and used by the therapist to promote healthy change for the Cuban client.

Brink (1984) suggested employing the Value Schedule (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) as an assessment device for the individual client and for the health-care giver in their assessment of their own value orientations. Comparing and contrasting the two profiles may prevent potential miscommunications, misunderstandings, and heighten mutual appreciation.

The future education of social workers and the education of others in the helping disciplines were considered in light of the results of the DuBray (1985) study. Instruction and training in the value orientations and culture of American Indians was declared a fundamental need in the curriculum of schools who prepare graduates for a place in the helping professions. The author stated that such knowledge could also be the first step in the development of effective social programs which could help those in need without interfering with the recipients right to cultural self-determination.

Cross-cultural value orientations theory and research offers our society, the science of psychology, and the professions of clinical and counseling psychology a great deal. It is unfortunate, however, that the numerous benefits which could be derived from this research are, to date, only potential benefits. Until the reliability and validity of the theory and the instruments can be firmly established, methodological rigor is improved, and results become generalizable, the numerous applications which are to be offered and discussed must be withheld from implementation.

Many potential applications have already been revealed by the research presented. Cultural value dynamics may be identified, compared and contrasted with other cultures. A possible method of measuring transmission of culture between members has been demonstrated. The Value Schedule has been used to measure acculturative change. Exploring the relationship between value orientations and other variables, such as race, ethnicity, racial

identity attitudes, demographics, health behaviors, and marijuana use offers an unlimited store of research possibilities.

This theory and its various measures could be used internationally to develop a taxonomy of world cultures. World history could be reassessed with a value orientations perspective. The within and between value orientation dynamics for both the historical and present-day world cultures could be used to assess current international situations. The quality of international and intranational policy could be improved with this type of information. The United Nations could heighten its effectiveness as a consortium of international negotiators, diplomats, and policy developers if cultural value orientations data was made available and meaningful. A nation could benefit from data about the value orientations of its people and use that information to promote national unity and production. Many of our societal institutions, like business, education, government, and religion, could improve their organizational development, policy, and goals with information about the varied value orientations of their people. Cross-cultural relationships occur in every facet of society. The degree of effectiveness and productiveness of those relationships among the general and working public is dependent upon an accurate understanding and appreciation for the variant values held by the other person involved in that cross-cultural relationship.

Cross-cultural values data increases the general social science knowledge base and that is an important contribution, alone. General clinical applications extending from this literature, however, begins with research contributions to psychology's knowledge base in general and to clinical psychology's knowledge base in particular. The study of values and value orientations theory should be a part of any psychology curriculum, especially the curriculum used in the training of clinical psychologists. Psychologists must understand the significant influence that culture and cultural values have upon the nature and functioning of a human being if they are to improve their understanding of human behavior.

If the research reviewed had possessed methodological rigor, numerous clinical applications would be forthcoming. For example, a generalized drug-treatment method might have been developed from the Green and Haymes (1973) study. Had the authors taken the time to establish and report reliability for the VOQ and if they had been more forthcoming

with data about the factor analysis, a firmer sense of the VOQ's construct validity may have been established. The frequent user's (FU) value orientation profile consisting of Present/Time, Individualistic/Relational, Being/Activity, Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature and Good/Human-Nature could have led to an individual, humanistic/gestalt therapy mode. This would be compatable with the FU's Time, Activity, and Relational value orientations. The FU's Harmony-with-Nature/Man-Nature value orientation could have suggested that alterations in the FU's environment may influence the degree of marijuana use. Contributing factors would need to be identified and eliminated. The Good/Human-Nature orientation could have suggested openness and trust which would be helpful in the therapeutic relationship. Yet, the anti-traditionalism (anti-Factor 1) orientation would have suggested that greater success could be achieved if the interventions and changes are framed as self-directed modern growth rather than submitting to the status quo.

Numerous other applications, like the one just offered, could be generated with reliable, valid, and rigorously performed research. The present state of the value orientations field, however, is comprised of great intentions followed by woeful research. Therefore, it would be improper to generate any more specific clinical applications from this body of research. A variety of general clinical applications with an eye towards future research, however, can be presented and considered.

The value orientations theory and research offer extensive potential implications for clinical psychology and the practicing psychotherapist. This theory and any future supportive research opens new and profound dimensions for clinical and personality psychology. These value orientations, like personality characteristics, are theorized to be a part of every subject of every experiment ever conducted, yet they have gone unnoticed and uncontrolled. Past research should be reconsidered in light of this theory and future research should account and control for value orientations. Results obtained in future clinical and personality research should use value orientations theory and research to enhance and broaden their interpretation of the results. This, along with future, specific and strong value orientations research, will greatly expand the clinical psychology knowledge base leading to increased general and specific competence.

The practicing clinical psychologist's effectiveness could be improved with an internalized and experiential knowledge of value orientations. Such knowledge should heighten the clinician's empathy skills if he has taken the opportunity to assess and affirm his/her own value orientations and has assessed the value orientations of the client. The clinician could share a deeper experiential sense of the client's emotions by gaining inner contact with similar values and accompanying thoughts, feelings and behaviors. This quality of empathy should yield new insights into the client's problems and enhance trust in the therapeutic relationship. The processing of discrepant values between the client and therapist could be a bridge to additional empathy and trust in the relationship.

The therapeutic environment could also be examined and made more sensitive to the client. Clearly, this application is not implying extreme or impossible changes but, depending on the clinician's clientele, some environmental changes might be in order and could go a long way to facilitating the overall therapeutic relationship. For example, if it is known that a client has a Collateral/Relational value orientation, then a shared level of dress and grooming between the psychotherapist and client could facilitate the client-therapist relationship. If the clinician's clientelle are diverse in their value orientations, then attempts should be made to make the environment as value-neutral as possible.

Not only should the therapeutic environment be versatile but so should the therapist. This is not to suggest that the therapist lacks a core self or has to be therapeutically eclectic, but even the most devout disciple of a psychological orientation cannot be so therapeutically rigid that he/she cannot adjust to the needs of a client with variant value orientations. A therapist whose psychotherapeutic mode is group-oriented should be willing to see a client with an Individual/Relational orientation in individual treatment at the outset of therapy and eventually work into a group situation if treatment requires it. If the therapist is unwilling to accommodate to the values of a client, the therapist should, at the very least, refer that client to someone who may more similarly share his/her value orientations.

Value orientations also plays an important part in the assessment and diagnosis of psychopathology and problems presented to a psychotherapist. The value orientations theory and research broadens our understanding of psychopathology and increases the choices and

opportunities for intervention. A thorough exploration and assessment of a client's value orientations and the value orientations of his/her family, culture, and any other relevant social institution, is vital to a proper diagnosis. The conceptualization of psychopathology and specific symptomatology has usually been based on cultural norms. When diagnosis is moved within the context of culture and value orientations, a shift in understanding symptomatology will occur.

Behavior and symptomatology should be referenced within the context of the individual's own particular culture and value orientations. As a result, the most accurate diagnosis would be obtained. An individual with an Evil/Human Nature, Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature, Past/Time, Being/Activity, and Lineal/Relational orientation may appear depressed and passive but the origins of this individual's behavior is a result of his/her culture and values and not a result of psychopathology and should be diagnosed as such. On the other hand, if you know the client's value orientations include Good/Human Nature, Harmony-with-or Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature, Present or Future/Time, Doing/Activity, and Collateral/Individual/Relational, yet the behavior is symptomatic of depression then the likelihood that the individual is depressed has increased. A thorough assessment is still required, however, for adequate diagnosis.

Knowledge of a client's value orientations is also important in determining if his/her symptomatology is environmentally, contextually, or systemically influenced. The proposed concepts of distance or transmission of culture (Caudill & Scarr, 1962) and spheres of behavior (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) have implications for clinical diagnosis and interventions. A clinician should determine if behavior which appears pathological is truly pathological if the values which generate that behavior stem from values transmitted to the client from his/her family or culture. The spheres of behavior concept suggests that values and subsequent behavior are varied by the context.

The clinician should consider whether diagnosed psychopathology is person-bound, situation-bound, both, or none of the above. If values and subsequent behavior is influenced by the context then some improvements could be made in patient behavior by altering the environment. Some psychological stress or problems could be the result of value orientation

conflicts between the client and his/her interrelational environment. Acculturative stress is a good, yet pronounced, example of this situation. Similar but less dramatic examples exist even within a culture. For example, a client could be experiencing anxiety or stress at work because his/her job requires behaviors or value orientations that are in conflict with his/her personal value orientations. A clinician's knowledge of the opposing value orientations should allow for a proper diagnosis.

Improved quality of service and treatment is available to a client when his/her therapist has knowledge of value orientations. First of all, an accurate and values-sensitive diagnosis can lead to improved and values-sensitive treatment. Value orientation information can increase the number and quality of treatment choices and opportunities for intervention. Some of the previous examples already illustrate this point. A marital couple who both possess an Individual/Relational orientation may gain greater assistance with cooperation training where they can learn how to obtain their desires through joint assistance rather than a humanistic/interpersonal growth approach.

Timing and tact are key ingredients to any successful therapy outcome. Awareness of value orientations can enhance these aspects of the therapist's functioning. Countertransference can be problematic in treatment if unchecked. A psychotherapist's awareness of his personal value orientations could go a long way in controlling that dynamic. A Doing/Activity oriented therapist could have issues of psychological pain associated with the Being/Activity orientation of a significant other. If this issue has not been fully processed and brought into the therapist's awareness, an unhealthy relationship may ensue between the therapist and a Being/Activity-oriented client.

Beyond countertransference, a clinician should experience personal growth and maturity from a self-exploration of value orientations. Usually, personal growth for a therapist contributes to professional growth and increased effectiveness. Further, knowledge of self and client value orientations allows the therapist greater insight into the interpersonal dynamics which evolve throughout the therapy process. Client transference, like therapist countertransference already discussed, could be tied to or initiated by value orientations and must be processed effectively. Treatment duration and realistic short and/or long-term

treatment planning could be greatly influenced by a client's value orientations. A Present or Future/Time and Doing/Activity client may likely prefer a brief, focused therapy and may not stay in treatment if results are not quickly achieved. In cases of dual-therapist interventions, awareness of the value orientations of everyone in the session is paramount, not only for transference/countertransference reasons but to facilitate the effectiveness of the treatment and the relationship between the two psychotherapists.

At times, some therapists bring in family and significant others to the therapy session or make necessary out of office contacts for the purpose of information gathering, communication, or therapeutic intervention. Some knowledge of the culture and value orientations held by these contact individuals could greatly facilitate communication, interaction, and directed activities. For example, a Doing/Activity, Present/Time, Individual/Relational significant other may be very helpful to a client and his/her therapist when the client is in crisis.

Value orientations could play a specific role in various forms of treatment. Several applications have been offered within the context of individual adult psychotherapy. Individual child psychotherapy can also benefit from the use of value orientations. A child with Good/Human Nature, Present/Time, Doing/Activity, and Individual/Relational orientation may be better served with a play therapy modality whereas a Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature, Being/Activity, Lineal/Relational orientation may receive more effective results from a family therapy approach.

Family and marital problems are sometimes the results of unknown value orientation conflict. A thorough value orientations assessment of each member and the general consensus of the couple and family as a whole will offer a wealth of information and dynamics which can increase the potential for effective treatment. Similar value orientations between individuals could be used experientially to foster cohesiveness while conflicting areas are processed. A family where the parents have a Lineal/Relational orientation but the children have an Individual/Relational orientation may learn to function at a Collateral/Relational orientation level when their shared orientation of Future/Time is engaged by assigning the family the task of planning a vacation, together.

In a similar way, a group therapist could facilitate group cohesiveness by identifying and

engaging shared value orientations while at the same time allowing value orientation conflicts to arise for individual and group processing. This would lead towards personal growth and enhanced group development.

Not only the modality of psychotherapy could be impacted by the use of value orientations but so could the psychotherapeutic orientation ascribed to by the therapist. For example, an analyst who begins treatment with a client whose value orientations include Evil/Human Nature, Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature, and Individual/Relational may find that a sitting versus a reclining position may more readily establish therapeutic trust. With the client's permission, a behavior therapist may involve a client's significant other as an accountability partner for follow-through on homework activities if that client's value orientations consist of Subjugation-to-Nature/Man-Nature, Past/Time, Being/Activity, and Lineal/Social Relations. A humanistic psychologist may determine that a client with an Evil/Human-Nature, Mastery-over-Nature/Man-Nature, Future/Time, and Doing/Activity orientation would have greater success working within a behavioral approach and make a referral.

In addition to conducting therapy sessions with clients, a psychotherapist frequently interacts, consults, and networks with other psychologists and professionals. Awareness of any value orientations held by other colleagues or professionals could enhance the interactions and the relationship potential. Such relationships are a professional and personal lifeline and anything which can nurture those relationships in an honest manner should be garnered.

This discussion of research applications should not be concluded until a potential ethical dilemma is considered. At the outset of this paper, value orientations were, in part, defined as basic and universal elements. The existential qualities of these elements often result in them going unnoticed by the individual possessing the value orientations. Several of these applications involve engaging these value orientations while they are unconscious to the client. Great care and ethical consideration must be implemented prior to employing any applications which may be or appear to be manipulative and/or which may curtail cultural- or self-determination. Clients and cultures must always be accorded insight and choice when seeking assistance and intervention from psychological professionals.

Recommendations for Future Research

Research which could lend support to the value orientations concept (Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, 1961) should first seek out other current theory and corresponding empirical research which could corroborate at least one or more of the numerous assumptions and postulates which comprise the overall value orientations theory and the Value Schedule. Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck's (1961) theory was immense and impressive but gathered little corroborative support.

One of the problems in accomplishing this future research goal is the lack of definitional clarity found in the literature with regards to the term value and culture and the presence of various other terms which seem to describe the same constructs. The consistent use of operationalized terminology is of paramount importance to the future of the value orientations theory, its related and supportive research, and its development into a viable construct. Theoretical validity is also of concern. The accusation that circular reasoning is being used in the identification of a culture must be addressed. This problem is, in part, dependent upon the development of operationalized terms. These concerns become additional goals of future research.

The development of reliable measures must be a top priority if future empirical research is to occur. Reliability is the first step towards establishing validity. If the instrument is inconsistent and unstable the results generated become meaningless. Only Ibrahim and Kahn's (1987) Scale to Assess World Views possessed multiple, stronger, and more substantive reliability measures. Various types of reliability, like split-half, odd-even, test-retest, alternate measures, and mean inter-item, should be employed regularly. Chronbach Alpha's should only be used as a last resort or only in conjunction with other reliability measures.

Future value orientations research must be equally sensitive to the establishment of validity for the chosen instrument. Poor methodological rigor noted throughout the literature hampered any firm validity for the instruments used and rendered the results suspect. Factor analyses should be instituted regularly to establish empirical validity. After strong reliability is established for these measures, they may have something to offer each other through joint administrations, correlation of instrument results, and the implementation of a

quasi-factor analysis between measures to derive any potential clusterings of items.

Many other specific methodological problems negatively affected the validity of these instruments and studies. It is vitally important that each weakness identified in the critique of this literature be acknowledged and addressed in future research. In addition to the validity problems, generalizability and replicability were also hampered by numerous methodological weaknesses such as nonrandom and skewed samples, inconsistency of test administration, a lack of distinction between racial and cultural groups, obscure definitions, unorthodoxed procedures, unreported or limited vital information, and sex and age biases.

The needs of value orientations research are great but the goal is so important to clinical psychology and to our society that energetic perseverence must be maintained in the pursuit of knowledge about value orientations and the instruments developed to measure it. It would be wise if the science of psychology, and the organizations which support it, would professionally and economically nuture solid theoretical and empirical research in this area. The need and demand for this type of research already exists and will only increase with time. Clinical psychology, as a science and a profession, needs additional and more definitive information about cross-cultural psychology, the value orientations theory and research, and its application. Clinical psychology training programs should insure that these issues become a vital and prominent part of their curriculum and training. Clinical psychologists need specific and quality-supervised cross-cultural training and an opportunity to internalize and integrate the value orientations concept and corresponding skills into their personal and professional functioning. Specific training, of this type, would improve their quality of service and their overall effectiveness as psychotherapists. The vitality and social significance of the science of psychology may, in part, be determined by the information, answers, and applications obtained from credible research about the politically vibrant issue of cross-cultural relations and the closely related theory of and research into value orientations.

REFERENCES

Bachtold, L.M., & Eckvall, K.L. (1978). Current value orientations of American Indians in northern California: The Hupa. Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 9(3), 367-375.

Barker, P.R., Manderschied, R.W., Hendershot, G.E., Jack, S.S., Schoenborn, C.A., and Goldstrom, I. (1992). Serious mental illness and disability in the adult household population: United States, 1989. In R.W. Manderschied & M.A. Sonnenschien (Eds.), Mental Health, United States, 1992 : Center for Mental Health Services and National Institute of Mental Health, DHHS Pub. No. (SMA) 92-1942 (pp. 255-298). Washington,DC: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Brink, P.J. (1984). Value orientations as an assessment tool in cultural diversity. Nursing Research, 33(4), 198-203.

Carter, R.T. (1990). Cultural value differences between African Americans and White Americans. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 71-79.

Carter, R.T. (1991). Cultural values: A review of empirical research and implications for counseling. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70(1), 164-172.

Carter, R.T., & Helms, J.E. (1987). The relationship of Black value-orientations to racial identity attitudes. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 19, 185-195.

Carter, R.T., & Helms, J.E. (1990). The Intercultural Values Inventory (Tests in Microfiche Test Collection No. 016582). Princeton, N.J: Educational Testing Service.

Carter, R.T., & Parks, E.E. (1992). White ethnic group membership and cultural value preferences. Journal of College Student Development, 33(6), 499-506.

Caudill, W., & Scarr, H. (1962). Japanese value orientations and culture change. Ethnology, 1, 53-91.

Day, J.C. (1992). Population projections of the United States, by age,sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1992 to 2050 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P25, No. 1092). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

DuBray, W.H. (1985). American Indian values: Critical factor in casework. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 66(1), 30-37.

Green, L.L., & Haymes, M. (1973). Value orientation and psychosocial adjustment at various levels of marijuana use. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 2(3), 213-231.

Harrison, J.D. (1974). The Kluckhohn value orientation instrument used in Papua New Guinea. New Guinea Psychologist, 6(1), 3-8.

Hollmann, F.W. (1990). U.S. population estimates, by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin: 1989 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 1057). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Ibrahim, F.A. (1991). Contribution of cultural worldview to generic counseling and development. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 13-19.

Ibrahim, F.A., & Kahn, H. (1987). Assessment of world views. Psychological Reports, 60, 163-176.

Keller, C., & Bergstrom, D. (1993). Value orientations in African-American women. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 76, 319-322.

Kluckhohn, C. (1967). Values and value-orientations in the Theory of Action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. Shields (Eds.), Toward a general theory of action (pp. 388-433). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kluckhohn, F.R. (1950). Dominant and substitute profiles of cultural orientations. Social Forces, 28, 375-394.

Kluckhohn, F.R. (1951). Dominant and variant cultural value orientations. Social Welfare Forum, 97-113.

Kluckhohn, F.R. (1953). Dominant and variant value orientations. In C. Kluckhohn & H.A. Murray (Eds.), Personality in nature, society and culture (pp. 342-357). New York: Knopf.

Kluckhohn, F.R., & Strodtbeck, F.L. (1961). Variations in value orientations. Evanston, Il: Row & Peterson.

Lingenfelter, S.G., & Mayers, M.K. (1986). Ministering cross-culturally. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House Company.

Lowe, C.M. (1959). Value orientations: An ethical dilemma. American Psychologist, 14, 687-693. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1961, 35(1), Abstract No. 97).

Mezei, L. (1974). Factorial validity of the Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck Value Orientation Scale. The Journal of Social Psychology, 92, 145-146.

Murdaugh, C.L. (1982). Instrument development to assess specific psychological variables explaining individual differences in preventive behaviors for coronary artery diseases (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43(3), 680B.

Murdaugh, C., & Hinshaw, A.S. (1986). Theoretical model testing to identify personality variables effecting preventive behaviors. Nursing Research, 35(1), 19-23.

Papajohn, J.C., & Spiegel, J.P. (1971). The relationship of culture value orientation change and Rorschach indices of psychological development. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 2(3), 257-272.

Stewart, E.C., & Bennett, M.J. (1991). American cultural patterns. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, Inc.

Sue, S., & Zane, N. (1987). The role of culture and cultural techniques in psychotherapy: A critique and reformulation. American Psychologist, 42(1), 37-45.

Szapocznik, J., Kurtines, W., & Hanna, N. (1979). Comparison of Cuban and Anglo-American cultural values in a clinical population. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47(3), 623-624.

Szapocznik J., Scopetta, M.A., Aranalde, M.A., & Kurtines, W. (1978). Cuban value structure: Treatment implications. Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology, 46(5), 961-970.

Williamson, E.G. (1958). Value orientation in counseling. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 36, 520-528. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1959, 33(4), Abstract No. 8279).

VITA

NAME:

David Laurel Scott, MFCC

EDUCATION:

Rosemead School of Psychology Clinical Psychology	Psy.D. (Cand.)
California State University, Long Beach School Psychology	Credential 1992
Rosemead School of Psychology Clinical Psychology	M.A. - 1986
University of Toledo Psychology and Sociology	B.A. - 1984

INTERNSHIP:

Lafayette Clinic Detroit, Michigan	1988 - 1989

PRACTICA:

Mid-Valley Community Mental Health Council Outpatient Program	1986 - 1988
Camarillo State Hospital Inpatient Program	1987
Dolland Elementary School School Practicum	1986

EMPLOYMENT:

Rowland Unified School District School Psychologist	1994 - 1995
Compton Unified School District School Psychologist	1991 - 1993
Boys Republic Residential Counselor	1990 - 1991
MacLaren Children's Center Children's Treatment Counselor	1986 - 1988